



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ART. V.—*On the Rock Inscriptions of Kapur di Giri, Dhauli, and Girnar; by PROFESSOR H. H. WILSON, Director of the Royal Asiatic Society.*

[Read 3rd February, 1849.]

THE circumstances under which the remarkable inscription at Shah baz gheri or Kapur di Giri was discovered and transcribed by Mr. Masson, and decyphered by Mr. Dowson and Mr. Norris have been already detailed in a preceding Journal, vol. VIII, and it was then shown by a comparison of one of the divisions of the inscription with a similar division of those of Girnar and Dhauli, that they were all three substantially the same. The interest excited by this identification, and the possibility that some of the difficulties in the reading and translation of the earlier known inscriptions might be explained by the one more recently discovered, naturally recommended the prosecution of the inquiry and the complete collation of the several inscriptions. In the absence of any person more competent to accomplish so desirable an object I consented to undertake the task, and now lay before the Society the result of the comparison. It has not, I fear, added materially to our knowledge of the purport of these curious documents, but it leaves no doubt of the identity in all material respects of the records preserved by the rocks of Guzerat, Cuttack, and Afghanistan.

At the same time that this collation of the inscriptions was effected, I thought it would be a favourable opportunity to revise the translations made by the late Mr. James Prinsep, of those of earlier discovery, particularly as the Society was possessed of valuable corrections of the original readings made by Mr. Prinsep himself, although unpublished, and by Captain Jacob and Mr. Westergaard in an entirely new transcript of the original, made and published by them in the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. As mentioned also on the former occasion, the Society was in possession of a fac-simile on muslin of the Girnar inscription, made by the Rev. Dr. Wilson of Bombay, and of copies presented by Mr. H. T. Prinsep and Captain Postans. Mr. Westergaard, also, was kind enough to furnish Mr. Norris with a copy of the same inscription, in which he corrected some of the typographic errors of the printed copy; and some further corrections have recently appeared in the

Bombay Branch Society's Journal, for July 1847, by Captain Jacob. With exception of the last, these several transcripts and corrections of the Girnar inscription were embodied with great care and infinite labour in a new representation of the whole, and engraved on stone by Mr. Norris himself. This transcript is now given to the public.

We are in like manner indebted to the ingenuity and indefatigable perseverance of Mr. Norris for the lithographed copy of the Kapur di Giri inscription, and I cannot offer a more striking proof of the labour which it imposed, and of the carefulness with which it has been executed, than by inserting Mr. Norris's own account of the process by which he has rendered the inscription accessible to the public. This account is as follows:—

“The manner in which the cloth was applied to the rock of Shah baz gheri to take off a fac-simile of the inscription, has been detailed in p. 299 of the eighth volume of the Society's Journal. It is important to add that the palm of the hand was used to produce the impression; and that the operator, perceiving as he went along, how the lines ran, followed them closely, striking them more particularly in the centre. The effect of this has been that the space between the lines is often left white, and that the tops and bottoms of each letter are less perfectly impressed than the middle. The result is that the letter *r*, and the vocalic marks which should be affixed to those parts of the letters, are often wanting; and the reading is so far imperfect.

“In order to produce a transcript, the cloth was closely attached by pins to a sheet of paper twenty-four feet by twelve feet, and then carefully extended upon a large table, previously covered with sheets of paper smeared over with a black composition, the face of the cloth being uppermost, and the large sheet of white paper in contact with the blackened paper on the table. An ivory point was then passed over every visible mark of letters upon the cloth; and thus a reversed copy in black was produced upon the underside of the paper. As the impression upon the cloth was reversed by being taken from the rock, the copy on the paper being again reversed was restored to its direct position. From this paper, by means of a pantograph, a copy was made, reduced to one-sixth linear dimension; and this, though nearly two yards long, was more manageable than the first copy, which being above twenty feet in length, could not be examined without much trouble. Upon the reduced transcript corrections were made by a minute collation with the original calico, every letter of which was examined, both by reflected and transmitted light, and many thus rendered visible which were unseen at the first attempt.

After this was done, the several detached pieces mentioned by Mr. Masson as the first results of his attempts on the rock, were separately transcribed, and reduced by pantograph, as the whole inscription had been; and although the impressions on these pieces were on the whole far inferior to those on the large cloth, yet in several cases they gave a legible word or letter, which was very doubtful, or altogether invisible on the other. After this, the copy taken by the eye was collated with the one corrected as just stated; and although quite illegible alone, it was in many parts valuable by suggesting the true reading of a doubtful word; and in some cases giving a word wholly wanting on the cloth.

“To sum up the whole, although I am compelled to admit that in many places the inscription given is rather an attempt to restore what is visible upon the rock than a copy of the impression upon the cloth entrusted to me, yet the greater part is, as nearly as I could trace it, a fac-simile of that impression; and all this part is distinguished by a full, thick character, as upon the cloth. Wherever the reading was uncertain, either from faintness of the impression, or because the only authority was the copy made by the eye, the character is drawn with thin lines; and in those parts it was found in most instances impossible to distinguish between the resembling letters *r*, *t*, and *v*; *d* and *n*; and *b*/*h* and *k*. So far then, and in the addition of the subjoined *r*, and of vowels, conjectural emendation is fully admissible. Even in the better parts the impression is not such as to insure perfect confidence. Such, in fact, is the condition of the cloth, partly arising from the rough surface of the rock when originally engraved, and its deterioration after the lapse of so many centuries, and partly owing to the imperfect means at the disposal of the gentleman by whom the copy was taken; probably also, in some degree, to damage sustained by the calico since it was impressed in 1838, the ink having apparently run over several of the characters and obliterated them, that many parts set down as certain, may hereafter, on examination of the rock, prove to be susceptible of correction.

“In one material particular the inscription given in the plate does not represent the cloth copy. The impression was taken upon cloth in separate pieces, which were subsequently sewed together under Mr. Masson's directions, upon that gentleman's return to Peshawar. As I proceeded on my task I found reason to suspect that some mistake had been made in sewing the pieces together; and this suspicion was confirmed when the inscription was found to resemble so closely those of Girnar and Dhauli. Four seams were found to be improperly joined; the direction of two of these, extending from the top to

the bottom of the cloth, will be seen by drawing lines from A to A, and from B to B in the fac-simile. In each of these cases the part on the left was shifted downwards, two lines below its proper place, so that, for example, the twentieth line ran first into the eighteenth, and then into the sixteenth. In the other cases, marked C and D, the pieces were smaller, and sewed on two or three sides. They were shifted on one side, and both so joined that some parts appeared in duplicate, and others were wanting: these gave more trouble than the others; but I believe they are now placed in their proper positions.

“In case it should be wished to elucidate any difficult passage of the inscription, or to remove any doubts of incorrect transcription, all the materials which furnished the accompanying lithograph may be seen at the Society’s House. Very possibly a subsequent examination will discover errors in the work, or find some letters or words that may have escaped me; but, in any case, what is done will be useful in pointing out where correction is needed, and will materially aid any one who may have an opportunity of examining the rock itself. It is much to be desired that the remaining part of the inscription containing, perhaps, the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth edicts, may be taken from the rock in fac-simile. The copies in the Society’s hands are sufficient to show that the rock contains in substance a great portion of the last three edicts of the Girnar inscription, but they are too imperfect to be legible generally, though singularly enough, it was this part of the inscription which furnished me with the word Devanampiya, and led to its identification. From this illegibility one line, containing the names of the five Western Kings must be fortunately excepted, which Mr. Masson copied with especial care, and even took off a cloth impression of a small portion, in spite of the difficulties presented by the position of the rock. A fac-simile of this piece, reduced to one-quarter of its original surface, is given in a corner of the lithograph.

“The copy of the back of the rock, as made by Mr. Masson, is given in the second plate, and at the foot of the plate is added a transcript of the above-mentioned portion relating to the Western Kings, made by a native in the service of M. Court, and sent to Professor Lassen, who has favoured the Society with it. This transcript appears to have embraced the whole of the rock; and, at first sight, would appear to have been carefully made, but on examination, it is found to be very imperfect. Many portions have been turned upside down; and it has been found impossible to trace the connection generally with what we have from Mr. Masson. The probability is, that the native copied

the inscription on detached pieces of paper, which were afterwards misplaced."

In order to exhibit with as much distinctness as possible the language of the inscriptions, I have written the whole of them with Mr. Norris's aid in Roman characters, agreeably to the system devised by Sir William Jones and followed by the Royal Asiatic Society, with a few unimportant exceptions; and I have placed the several inscriptions, so written, in parallel lines, in order to bring the words of each in juxta-position as far as was practicable. They accordingly form four lines. The upper line represents Mr. J. Prinsep's original readings, as published in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, vol. VI., p. 228, and above the line, in a smaller character, are inserted his subsequent corrections, as given in a copy of the *Journal*, corrected by himself, and placed at Mr. Norris's disposal by his brother Mr. H. T. Prinsep. Small numerals refer to the lines of our own lithographed copy. This line I have designated G *a*. The second line is the representation of the copy now lithographed, and which I have generally referred to as Mr. Westergaard's copy, as he has the larger share in it. This is marked G *b*. The third line marked D repeats the Dhauili inscription as given by Mr. Prinsep. We have not yet been fortunate enough to have had a second and revised transcript, although it is very desirable. The lower line is marked K, as being rendered into Roman letters from the lithographed copy of the Kapur di Giri inscription. The small figures here also refer to the lines of the original. Where blanks occur in either of the inscriptions they are denoted by asterisks: where words are wanting for the collation although there is no blank in the inscription, a line supplies their place. By this arrangement, it is hoped that a ready reference may be made to the lithographed originals; and that the critical remarks which follow each separate tablet may be conveniently compared with the passages to which they relate.

TABLET I.

G <i>a</i>	¹ Iyam	¹ dhammalipī	devānam	piyena	² Piyadasinā	Rāñā
G <i>b</i>	Iyam	dhammalipī	devānam	piyena	Piyadasinā	Rāñā
D	¹ * *	ghi savatasi	devānam	piya *	* * * *	* *
K	¹ Aya	dhamalipi	devanam	priyasa	* * * *	Rajo

G a	lekhápitá.	Idha	na	kan ⁱ chi	jivam	árabhitá	paju
G b	lekhápitá.	Idha	na	kanchi	jívam	árabhittá	paju
D	* * * * *	* * *	* * *	* * *	* nam	álabhitu	pajapa
K	likhapi	*	idam	loke	cha	* jivanam	ara * * * *

G a	hitaya ^m	'na	cha	samája ^s	katavye ^o	bahu	repidasam
G b	hitavyam	na	cha	samáje	katavyo	bahukam	hi dosam
D	* * * *	*	*	* * *	* * *	* * * *	* * *
K	* * cha	*	pi	* sama	* * *	* * * *	* * *

G a	samájamhi	paḍati ^s	devánam	piya ^o	Piyadasi	Rája
G b	samájamhi	pasati	devánam	piyo	Piyadasi	Rájá
D	* * * *	* * *	* * *	* *	* * *	* *
K	* * * *	* * *	* * *	* *	* * *	* *

G a	asti	pitu	ekachá	samája	sádhumatá	devánam	'piyasa
G b	asti	pitu	ekachá	samája	sádhumatá	devánam	piyasa
D	* * * *	* * bha	palápá	sádhumatá	devánam	piyasa	
K	'asti	pi	* katia—	samayasa	samato —	devanam	priyasa

G a	Piyadasino	rāño	pura	mahánase	thu he ^{pe}	devánam	piyasa
G b	Piyadasino	rāño	purá	mahánase	jamá	devánam	piyasa
D	Piyadasino	* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *	* *
K	Priyadaśisa	rajo	para	mahanasasa	—	devanam	priyasa

G a	Piyadasino	rāño	anudivasam	ba'húni	pána	satasahasáni
G b	Piyadasino	rāño	anudivasam	bahúni	pána	satasahasáni
D	* * * *	* *	* * * *	* * *	pána	sata * *
K	Priyadaśisa	rajo	anudivasa	bahuni	pana	hada * asani

G a	árabhisu	supátháya	sa ^{se}	aja	yadá	ayam	dhamalipi
G b	árabhisu	súpátháya	sa	aja	yadá	ayam	dhammalipi
D	*labhiyisu	supatháya	* * *	* dá	* *		dhammalipi
K	* * * *	* * * *	* * * *	* * *	* *		dhamalipi

G a	likhitáti	eva	pána	árabhisa	supátháya	dwámará
G b	likhitáti	eva	pána	árabhiro	súpátháya	dwamará
D	likhitáti	* *	* *	* labhiya	* * * *	* * * *
K	likhita	anatam	yato	praña	hiñoti	* * jata katl

G a	eko	mato	so	pi	^o ra	magána	^o dhuvá	^{to} eka	ⁱ pátí	páná
G b	eko	mato	so	pi		magona	dhuvo	ete	pátí	páná
D	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	síni	pánáni
K	sti	mago	na	so	pi	mago	na	dhavalasa	pu	panam

G a	—	pachhá	ná	arabbisande.
G b	—	pachhá	na	árabbisande.
D	—	pachhá	na	álabhiyisata.
K	trayi	pacha	na	arabbisanti.

THE first portion of the inscription on the rock at Kapur di Giri has suffered materially from the effects of time and exposure, but enough remains distinct to establish its identity, in all essential points, with the inscriptions at Girnar and Dhauli.

It opens with a similar phrase, although differing in the first word, using the pronoun, *aya*,—or more properly, *ayam*,—instead of, *iyam*, “this.” The nasal terminations are generally omitted in this inscription; an omission referable, perhaps, to carelessness in the sculpture or to the subsequent effacement of the simple and possibly superficial mark of the nasal. *Ayam*, as well as, *iyam*, is the Sanskrit pronoun; the former the masculine, the latter the feminine. But in Pali, *ayam*, is of both genders, and the Girnar inscription, therefore, is Sanskrit rather than Pali in its use of, *iyam*; as Prinsep observes, *ayam*, is also used in place of, *iyam*, in some of the other Girnar tablets,—*ayam dhammalipi*, this writing of the law is the same in both inscriptions, only that we have, *dhama*, instead of, *dhamma*; the nasal mark of the first, *m*, being either omitted or obliterated.

The title of the prince, *devanam priyasa*, in the genitive case, next occurs, corresponding, except in the case, with the *devánam piyena*, of Girnar. We have, however, to notice one or two orthographical peculiarities: we have first, *devanam*, not *devánam*—the short penultimate vowel instead of a long one; *devánam* for *devánám*, is a Pali divergence from Sanskrit—but the short quantity of the first, *a*, is peculiar to Kapur di Giri. It is not, however, confined to this case, for throughout the inscriptions a long, *á*, like the short, is very seldom written. It may be doubted if any distinction is observable between the other short and long vowels, although there is an appearance occasionally of a long, *í*. The other peculiarity is the more correct Sanskrit form of *Priya* instead of the Pali, *Piya*; there is a line at the foot of the, *p*, which cannot well be anything else than the conjunct, *r*. It is the more remarkable, because Prakrit and Pali are very chary of compound consonants, and because it corrobo-

rates the co-existence of the radical form, *priya*, and its corruption, *piya*; of the Sanskrit original, and its dialectic derivative. We have also to remark the use of the genitive instead of the instrumental, but this is compatible with the rules of Pali syntax. The name of the prince is omitted, but we have his designation, *rajo*, of the king, followed by the participle, *likhapita*, caused to be written. This edict has been caused to be written of (by) the beloved of the gods the Raja (*Priyadasi*?).

The following phrase in the Girnar inscription presents several difficulties which the Kapur di Giri copy does not enable us to clear up, although it may suggest a conjecture; but it is here very indistinct and imperfect. Prinsep has, *idha na kanchi jivam árabhitá*, the latter in Mr. Westgaard's copy is, *árabhittá*. Our reading seems to be, *idam loke cha (na?) jivanam ara*, the rest wanting. *Idam*, can scarcely be connected with *loke*, or we might render it, in this world, but, *idam*, is the nominative neuter, and, *loke*, the locative—an inadmissible concord, but the Kapur di Giri sculptors do not appear to have suffered grammatical niceties to stand in their way. *Jivanam*, may be intended for the genitive plural, a reading which concurs with that apparently of the Dhauli inscription; in either case we may admit that, living creature, or, of living creatures, is meant. It is unlucky that so much of the corresponding word, *árabhitá*, should be effaced, for it is a very awkward word to be disposed of; the sense is doubtful; yet upon its right interpretation depends the meaning of the whole inscription. I am not at all satisfied that it has been rightly rendered, but it may be possibly connected with the sense of putting to death, and Mr. Prinsep so translates it. He treats the word as the abstract noun, "the putting to death of living beings is not to be done." But according to his reading, *jivam*, the nominative or accusative singular, cannot be in concordance with another abstract noun in the nominative case, and so far, *jivanam*, for, *jivánam*, were preferable, as it occurs at Kapur di Giri: *árabhittá*, with a double, *t*, however, is not the Pali form of, *árabhitá*—it might, if the final were short, represent, *arabhitvam*—the neuter abstract, or it may be thought intended for the past indeclinable participle, *arabhitwá*, although that were an irregular formation, since the Prakrit and Pali adhere to the Sanskrit type, and would be correctly, *arabhya*, or, *arabh-i-a*. Admitting it, however, to be the abstract substantive, and that the expression implies, the putting to death of living beings, what follows? Prinsep says, is not to be done either for the benefit of the *puja*, or in convivial meetings, *puja hitáya na cha samáje katavyc*. But this can scarcely be admitted; the corrected copy reads, *paju hitayam na cha samája katavyo*. Mr. Westergaard's copy has, *hitavyam*.

We have no help from the Kapur di Giri table, although one or two fragments correspond. It might be thought that, *hitavyam*, is connected with, *árabhittá*, meaning, slaughter is to be abandoned. But the neuter participle were inconsistently in concord with a feminine noun. This has the advantage, however, of separating, *katavyo*, also masculine, from, *árabhittá*, and restricting it to, *saṁāja*, in which case we have two sentences complete; "sacrifice for worship (?) is to be discontinued, neither is any public meeting to be made." *Samāja*, does not necessarily signify a convivial assembly, but such an interpretation is allowable. *Katavyo*, it may be observed, is neither Sanskrit nor Pali; in the former it would be *karttavya*, in the latter, *katabbo*.

Much cruelty of this nature occurs in such assemblies, is Mr. Prinsep's translation of the following words, as he at first read them, *repi dasam saṁājamhi paḍati*, but his copy was erroneous, and he afterwards corrected it to *bahukam hi dosam saṁājamhi pasati*. Mr. Westergaard has the same corrected reading, *bahukam hi dosam saṁājamhi pasati*, which, with the governing words that follow *devānam piya piyadasī rājā*, make sense.—For the beloved of the gods king Piyadasi sees much that is blameable in convivial assemblies. Whether his objections were political or religious may be doubted, but, in either case, his interference with "cakes and ale," is not very creditable to the good fellowship of Raja Piyadasi.

Mr. Prinsep carries the government of the nominative, *Piyadasī Raja*, to the following words, reading them, *asti pitu*, and explaining the passage, *Piyadasī*, &c., is as it were a father (to his people). But he was not satisfied with the interpretation, and it is most probably incorrect. We have the corrected reading of Westergaard, *asti pi tu*; the Kapur di Giri tablet has, *asti pi*, so far confirming either. The sentence probably begins with the verb, and, *pi*, and, *tu*, are conjunctions; the first being usually employed in Prakrit instead of *api*, verily, indeed, and the sentence is, but indeed there is one assembly which is held respectable (in the estimation) of the Raja. Our inscription somewhat differs in the words following *asti pi*, having, *katīā*, with a blank and, *saṁayasa saṁato devānam priyasa*, the two first words of the latter may mean, sameness of agreement, concurrence, assent, but it is difficult to assign any applicable meaning to *katīā*, understanding it to be intended for the dialectical form of, *kritwā*, although the Pali would be *katwā*, or if, *ya*, be used, it is *kariya*. In place of *Piyadasīno* which follows the analogy of the Sanskrit declension of nouns in, *i*, we have *Priyadaśīsa*, the analogous genitive of nouns in, *a*. It is a variety admitted in Pali grammar. Mr. Prinsep's version of the whole passage makes the sense something very

different, depending upon his reading *ekáchá*, uniformity of worship, but this is very questionable. Mr. Westergaard's copy has apparently, *eka*, not, *eká*, and if the Sanskrit, *archá*, were intended in the second part of the compound, we ought to have, *archa*, or, *ach-chá*; the word itself also would not be appropriately used for worship, in general: the more probable reading is, *eka cha*, or perhaps, *eka vá*, connected naturally enough in the manner proposed above with what precedes and what follows; but there is, however, one social meeting, &c.

The assembly which the Raja patronises appears to be that of his own kitchen—as if he wished to monopolize the good cheer of his dominions; or as Prinsep renders the passage, Formerly in the great refectory and temple of the heaven-beloved, &c.,—reading it, *pura mahánase thulhe devánam piyasa*,—he admits however that the meaning of, *thulhe*, is doubtful. Mr. Westergaard has, *jamá*, in place of, *thulhe*, an equally doubtful term. The Kapur di Giri inscription has no equivalent of either, and yet has no blank—instead of, *mahánase*, it has, *mahanasasa*, and, *para*, for, *pura*,—giving a rather preferable sense—or the sanction of the beloved of the gods, to the great or supreme kitchen of the same; but what happens there? a transaction very incompatible with the sovereign's previous interdiction, for there every day many living beings, hundreds of thousands are slaughtered. The Kapur di Giri inscription agrees with the reading of Girnar, until we come to the verb, when there is a blank, which is unlucky, for that which looks like the verb, *árabhisu*, wants confirmation. However, it is possibly only a slight error for, *arabhinsu*, the nasal mark having disappeared; this is the form of the indefinite past tense, and as there is no difference of form in this tense in the active and passive voice, we are at liberty to ascribe to it the force of the latter, and translate it, have been killed; all the inscriptions have, *páná*, for *práná*, life, living thing, and the plural neuter nominative ends in, *á*, as well as in, *áni*. We have no word corresponding to *supátháya*, which follows, *árabhisu*, in the Girnar tablet, rendered by Mr Prinsep, for the sake of food, but the Sanskrit, *súpa*, is literally soup, not food, and we can scarcely suppose that hundreds of thousands of living beings were boiled down for soup in king Pi-yadasi's kitchen. The first syllable in the first copy of the Girnar inscription is short, but it appears to be long in Mr. Westergaard's copy. We cannot, however suppose, *súpa*, to be intended, and it may be allowable to consider it as the particle, *su*, good, while, *patháya*, is the dative case of a noun, *patha*, way, so that the compound may imply, for a good or righteous purpose.

The Girnar inscription proceeds, to-day when this writing of the law, or edict is promulgated; the Kapur di Giri tablet concurs in

the reading of, dhamalipi likhita, with a small blank, which may have been filled up by, ti, a syllable rather perplexing, although unnoticed by Mr. Prinsep; it may be intended for the conventional sign of the end of a sentence, iti, but the compound should in that case be, likhite ti, even in Pali.

The following passages differ materially in the two inscriptions, and it is scarcely safe to attempt an explanation of either. Mr. Prinsep renders the Girnar inscription, so even at this day, while this edict is under promulgation from the sacrifice of animals for the sake of food, some two are killed, or one is killed; which is by no means satisfactory. We might render the Girnar inscription, So, to-day, while this edict is promulgated, animals may be killed for proper purposes, taking the corrected form, árabhire, as the third person plural of the potential mood, which in one form is, árabheran, but what is meant by, dwamerá, or, dwomerá, cannot be satisfactorily conjectured; it certainly cannot mean, two are killed. The reading of the Kapur di Giri tablet is quite different, and is equally unintelligible, although, praña hinote, may mean, who injures human beings.

Of the following words, eko mato so pi, Mr. Prinsep considers that the two first may mean, one is killed, in connection with, dwamara, which he would render, dwau mritau, two are killed,—admitting, however, that the whole is unintelligible. In the late corrections of the Girnar inscription by Captain Jacob, we have a modification of, dwa, but it looks like, dth, and is unsatisfactory,—a more serviceable correction however follows; instead of, eko mato, we have, eko mago, one way or road, eka márga, which connects very well with what follows, so pi mago na dhuvo, but that road or way is not established, not permanent, or, dhruva. The Kapur di Giri reading confirms this, and apparently supplies the verb, sti, for, asti; there is (but one right) way, sti mago; it inserts here the negative, na, as well as in the following, so pi mago na, but this is probably a blunder. For, mago na dhuvo, Mr. Prinsep's first reading was, rama gána dhuvá, which he rendered, the joyful chorus resounds again and again, supposing that the two first words might be intended for, ramya gána, although he acknowledged that this was doubtful. In fact there was no, ra, in the inscription, and the rest is, mago na, as above.

Again the Girnar tablet gave as first read, eka páti páña, which Mr. Prinsep renders, a single animal, but, eka, has been changed to, etc, these,—and we therefore require something to fill up the sense. Eto páná, might be rendered, etc práná, these living beings, but then what becomes of páti? It would seem preferable

therefore to combine the two words and consider, páti páná, as representing the Sanskrit, pratipanná, produced, promulgated, completing an intelligible passage thus,—there is but one right way, and as that way is not fixed, these presents are promulgated to establish it; hereafter they (living beings) shall not be put to death; all the copies of the inscriptions agreeing, or very nearly, in the concluding words, pachhá na arabhisande. In what immediately precedes, the Kapur di Giri inscription, although entire, is doubtful, and probably corrupt.

Putting together the result of these observations the translation proposed, subject, be it always remembered, to correction in every phrase, will be—

Proposed Translation.

“This is the edict of the beloved of the gods, Raja Priyadasi; the putting to death of animals is to be entirely discontinued, and no convivial meeting is to be held, for the beloved of the gods, the Raja Priyadasi, remarks many faults in such assemblies. There is but one assembly, indeed, which is approved of by the Raja Priyadasi, the beloved of the gods, which is that of the great kitchen of Raja Priyadasi, the beloved of the gods; every day hundreds of thousands of animals have been there slaughtered for virtuous purposes, but now although this pious edict is proclaimed that animals may be killed for good purposes, and such is the practice, yet as the practice is not determined, these presents are proclaimed that hereafter they shall not be killed.

Mr. Prinsep's Translation.

“The following edict of religion is promulgated by the heaven-beloved king PRIYADASI. ‘In this place the putting to death of anything whatever that hath life, either for the benefit of the puja, or in convivial meetings, shall not be done. Much cruelty of this nature occurs in such assemblies. The heaven-beloved king PRIYADASI is (as it were) a father (to his people). Uniformity of worship is wise and proper for the congregation of the heaven-beloved PRIYADASI rája.

“Formerly in the great refectory and temple of the heaven-beloved king PRIYADASI, daily were many hundred thousand animals sacrificed for the sake of meat food. So even at this day while this religious edict is under promulgation, from the sacrifice of animals for the sake of food, some two are killed, or one is killed:—but now the joyful chorus resounds again and again—that from henceforward not a single animal shall be put to death.’ ”

TABLET II.

G a	^a Savata vijitemhi devánam piyasa Piyadasino raño
G b	Savata vijitamhi devánam piyasa Piyadasino raño
D	*avata vimitamsi devánam piyasa Piyadasine * *
K	Savatam vijite devanam priyasa Priyadaśisa raja
G a	^{i ch} evamapápavantesu yathá ^á Choḍa ^o Píḍa Satiyaputo
G b	evamapipávantesu yathá Choḍá Páḍá Satiyaputo
D	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
K	* * * * * * * * * * yi 'Palaya Satiya putra
G a	^{a á} Ketaleputo, a ^ñ Tamba ³ paññi Antiyako yona rája ye
G b	Ketalaputá a Tambapaní Antiyako yona rája ye
D	* * * * * * * * * * tiyoke náma yona lája yá
K	cha Keralamputra Tambapani Antiyoka ne yona raja ye
G a	vá pi — tasa ^{nsan} Antiyakasa sámino 'rájano, savata
G b	vá pi — tasa Antiyakasá sámipam rájano savata
D	vá * — * sa Antiyokasa sámantá lājáne savata
K	cha araña tasa Antiyokasa samata rajaya sakato
G a	devánam piyasa Piyadasino raño dwe ⁱ chikíchhá katá
G b	devánam piyasa Piyadasino raño dwe chikíchha katá
D	devánam piyasa Piyadasine la * * * * *
K	devanam priyasa Priyadaśisa raño kisa kabha * *
G a	ⁱ manusa chikíchhá cha pasu ⁱ chikíchhá cha ^{ad} osudhání
G b	manusa chikíchhá cha pasu chikíchhá cha osudhání
D	* * * * * ká cha pa * * * sa cha * dhání
K	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
G a	cha yáni manusopagáni cha ⁱ pasopagáni cha yata
G b	cha yáni manusopagáni cha pasopagáni cha yata
D	* áni muniso * * ni * pasu-opagánáni cha ata
K	* ^e * janaśopakaniha * paśopakani cha yata
G a	yata násti savata párápitáni cha ropápitáni cha múláni
G b	yata násti savatá hárápitáni cha ropápitáni cha múláni
D	* * natthi sa — pālápita — lopapita cha mú * *
K	yatra nasti savatra harapita

G a	cha	phaláni	cha	yata	yata	násti	savata	hárápítáni
G b	cha	phaláni	cha	yata	yata	násti	savata	hárápítáni
D	*	*	*	*	*	*	* vata	hálopitá
K								
G a	cha	ropápítáni	cha	*pathesu	kúpá	cha	khánápítá	
G b	cha	ropápítáni	cha	panthesú	kúpa	cha	khánápítá	
D	cha	lopápítá	cha	ma *	* udapánáni	—	khanápítáni	
K			vata	cha	kupa	cha	khanapita	
G a	vachhá	cha	ropapitá	paribhogáya	pasu	manusánam		
G b	vachhá	cha	ropápítá	paribhogáya	pasu	manusánam		
D	lukhani	cha	lopápítáni	patibhogaya	pa ***	* * * ánam		
K				pratibhogaye	paśu	manusánam		

The portion of the Kapur di Giri inscription, which corresponds with the second Tablet of Girnar and Dhauli, is less imperfect than that which answers to the first Tablet, and in the few blanks which occur, it admits of being conjecturally completed without any great violence.

There are, however, several omissions as compared with the Girnar sculpture, which are apparently intentional, constituting a variety in the language, though not in the general purport of the inscriptions. The inscriptions correspond also in the chief point of interest, the mention of Antiochus, the Yona Raja.

The inscription commences with the phrase, Savata vijite, followed by a short blank, which may be filled up without much risk of error by the syllable, mhi, of the Girnar tablet; everywhere in the conquered countries, which is followed by the usual designation of the beloved of the gods Piyadasi, the genitive being as before Priyadaśisa: the word, countries, it may be presumed, is understood in all the inscriptions.

We have no equivalent for what follows, which is read by Mr. Prinsep, evamapápavantesu. In Westergaard's copy it might be read, mahi páchantesu, but it is perhaps only, evam api pachantesu, (for pratyanteshu) also even in the bordering countries, not as Prinsep proposes, as well as in the parts occupied by the faithful. Nor have we any equivalent for Chóda, conjectured by Prinsep to be that portion of the south of India, which is known as Chola, or Cholamandala, whence our Coromandel.

Instead of Pída, which requires to be corrected to Pádá, we have Palaya, and then Satiya putra cha Keralamputra Tambapani, in near approach to Satiya puto Ketalaputá and Tambapani, words which have

been thought intended to designate places in the south of India, but of which the two first, Palaya and Satiya-puto, are new and unknown. Kerala is no doubt a name of Malabar, as Chola is of the opposite coast, but we also find both words in combination with others designating countries or people in the north-west, as "Kamboja, Yavana, Chola, Murala, Kerala, Saka." Gana Páthra, referring to a Súra of Páṇini. 4. 1. 175. Tambapani it has been proposed to identify with Tāmraparni or Ceylon, but further research may also remove that to the north. The same authority giving the Gaṇa or list of words indicated in the Sutra, 5. 1. 116, explains them to signify tribes of fighting men, and specifies among them Savitri-putra, which offers some analogy to the Satiyo putra of the inscription. It is much more likely that countries in the north-west than in the extreme south of India are intended.

We next come to the important passage in which a Greek name and designation occur. Both the Girnar copies read, Antiyako yona rája; the Kapur di Giri has, Antiyokane yona raja, but the two last letters, ne, are rather doubtful. It should perhaps be, Antiyoke nama, as at Dhauli, where we have, tiyoke nama yona lája. The use of the nominative case, however, offers a syntactical perplexity, for there is not any verb through which to connect Antiochus with the rest of the sentence, and it seems unusual to associate the name of an individual with those of places. Mr. Prinsep supplies the defect with, the dominions of Antiochus the Greek, but we have no term for, the dominions, nor is the noun in the genitive case, as it is in what follows. In this the Kapur di Giri inscription nearly agrees with that of Girnar, and it may be read, ye cha a raña tasa Antiyokasa samata rajaya sakato devanam priyasa, &c., that of Girnar being, ye vá pi tasa Antiyakasa sámipam rájano savata. Either may be rendered, and those princes who are near to Antiochus everywhere; although rajaya is an unusual form of the plural of raja, being neither Sanskrit nor Pali. The object of prefixing, a, to rajna in the word araña being equivalent to no king, is not very intelligible, and it can scarcely be doubted, that, sakato, should be, savata, as found both at Girnar and Dhauli. It seems likely that there may be some inaccuracies in this part, either in the original or the copy. But admitting a concurrent reading, we still want a connecting word, and it is not specified what these neighbours or dependants of Antiochus are to do. We may presume that they are expected to attend to the object of the edict, or they may be comprehended in the list of the, savata vijite, the conquered. The name of, Devanam priya, follows, as in the other inscriptions, but we then have, kisa

kaḥha, a very singular expression. It may be intended, however, for the phrase of Girnar, *chikīchha katā*, omitting the first syllable. It is unluckily followed by a chasm in the inscription which leaves it uncertain what duty or office was enjoined. The Girnar table has in this place the expression which Mr. Prinsep renders, every where Piyadasi's double system of medical aid is established—both medical aid for men and medical aid for animals, together with medicaments of all sorts which are suitable for men and for animals. There may have been something of the kind in the Kapur di Giri inscription, as it resumes with, *janaśopakani cha paśopakani cha*, beneficial for man and animals; and proceeds in the same terms as the Girnar and Dhauli inscriptions, wherever there is not (such) every where (they have been—); the sense of the following word, *hārāpitāni*, is not clear, but it is the corrected reading of the Girnar inscription also. The first reading was *parāpitāni*, as if for *prāptāni*, obtained, provided; *hārāpitāni* may possibly be so explained, or may signify, taken, conveyed; but the term is of an unusual form and doubtful purport, and would more legitimately denote, removed, taken away. The other term *ropāpitāni*, caused to be planted, has no representative in the Kapur di Giri rock; but admitting its correct interpretation, it indicates that medicaments cannot be meant by *osadhāni*. It is not in fact the Pali form of, *aushadha*, a medicament, but, *oshadhi*, a deciduous plant, which might be medicinal or not, or which might yield an article of vegetable diet, as for instance any of the edible grains, in which sense it is probably here employed.

There is no defect in the part of the Kapur di Giri inscription which immediately follows, but it omits the whole passage found in the Girnar tablet, which Mr. Prinsep has translated, (they) are to be planted, both root-drugs and herbs, (more correctly roots and fruits), wheresoever there is not, in all such places they shall be deposited and planted. We have nothing of this at Kapur di Giri. The inscription proceeds with, *vata cha*, of which the first may be a mutilation of, *savata*, everywhere, and then goes on to the close, to the purport of the Girnar inscription, but abridges it, stating in fact alone, that wells have been dug for the respective use of men and animals; omitting all mention of trees having been planted. The term for well is, *kūpa*, the regular Sanskrit word as it occurs at Girnar; the last term is, *prati-bhogaya*, which is confirmed by the Dhauli inscription, which gives the Prakrit *pati*, in place of the Sanskrit *prati*. At Girnar, both copies read, *paribhogāya*, complete use, but, *prati*, is the more germane to the sense.

The provision of vegetables—the measures to secure a supply of

roots and fruits—the planting of trees, and the digging of wells for the use, or literally the respective enjoyment (*pratibhoga*) of men and beasts, look more like arrangements intended to facilitate travelling than to cure sickness, and it may be doubted if the Girnar document contemplates any such design. The term, *chikichha*, is said by Mr. Prinsep to be the Pali form of, *chikitsā*, the application of remedies, but this is questionable. It would rather be, *chikichha*, with a short, not a long *i*; but in fact, the Pali form as it appears in vocabularies is, *tikichhā* or *tikichhā'*. The word is more probably the Prakrit form of, *chikīrsha*, the wish or will to do; and the edict, in fact announces that it has been the two-fold intention of the Raja to provide, not physic, but food, water, and shade for animals and men when traversing his own territories, or those of his Greek neighbour. In this view of the question, we may translate the more entire Girnar inscription to the following effect, inclosing those paragraphs in brackets which are not found in the Kapur di Giri inscription.

Proposed Translation.

In all the subjugated (territories) of the King Priyadasi, the beloved of the gods, and also in the bordering countries, as (*Chóda*), Palaya, (or Paraya,) Satyaputra, Keralaputra, Tambapani, (it is proclaimed), and Antiochus by name, the Yona (or Yavana) Raja, and those princes who are near to, (or allied with) that monarch, universally (are apprised) that (two designs have been cherished by Priyadasi: one design) regarding men, and one relating to animals; and whatever herbs are useful to men or useful to animals, wherever there are none, such have been everywhere caused to be conveyed and planted, (and roots and fruits wherever there are none,

Mr. Prinsep's Translation.

“Everywhere within the conquered province of *rāja PİYADASI* the beloved of the Gods, as well as in the parts occupied by the faithful, such as *Chola*, *Pida*, *Satīyaputra*, and *Ketalaputra*, even as far as *Tumbapannī* (Ceylon); and moreover within the dominions of *ANTIOCHUS*, the Greek, (of which *ANTIOCHUS*'s generals are the rulers,)—everywhere the heaven-beloved *rāja PİYADASI*'s double system of medical aid is established;—both medical aid for men, and medical aid for animals; together with the medicaments of all sorts, which are suitable for men, and suitable for animals. And wherever there is not (such provision)—in all such places they

¹ See Clough's Vocab, p. 43, also a manuscript alphabetical Pali vocabulary, Bodleian Library.

such have been everywhere conveyed and planted; and on the roads) wells have been caused to be dug, (and trees have been planted) for the respective enjoyment of animals and men.

are to be prepared, and to be planted: both root-drugs and herbs, wheresoever there is not (a provision of them) in all such places shall they be deposited and planted."

"And in the public highways wells are to be dug, and trees to be planted, for the accommodation of men and animals."

TABLET III.

G a	^o	'Devánampiya	Piyadasi	rájá	evam	áha	dwádasa	vasá
G b		Devánampiyō	Piyadási	rāja	evam	áha	dwádasa	vásá
D		Devánampiyō	Piyadasi	lāja	hevam	áhá	duwádasa	vasá
K		Devanampriyo	Priyadaśi	rāña	—	ahati	bavaya	vasha

G a	blisitena	mayá	idam	añapitam	² savata	vijite	mama
G b	blisitena	maya	idam	añapitam	savata	vijite	mama
D	blisitena	me	iyam	ána [*] tam	* * *	* * to	sá me
K	* * *	*	* * *	* * *	* * *	⁶ vijite	—

G a	yutá	cha	rajuke	cha	pádesake	cha	panchasu	panchasu
G b	yutá	cha	rájúke	cha	padesike	cha	panchasu	panchasu
D	yuga	*	* * *	*	* * * *	*	pa [*] chasu	pauchasu
K	yota	—	rajaki	—	padesi	va	pa * sha	pachashu

G a	vásesu	anusá ⁿ 'yinam	siyátu	etáyeva	atháya
G b	vásesu	anusányinu	niyáta	etáyeva	atháya
D	vasesu	anusayánam	nikhamávú	athá	annayepi
K	vasheshu	anusayanam	nikhamatu	cti	sato

G a	—	imáya	dhammánusanstáya	yathá	apo'ya	sá
G b	—	imáya	dhammánusastiya	yatha	achoya	ei
D	kaminanc	hevam	imáye	dhamá	anusayasá	—
K	kavayo	—	imisa	dhamanuśrastaye	sa	anaye pi

G a	kammáya	sadhu	mátari	cha	pitari	cha	susúsá ^{stási}	mita ^á
G b	kammáya	sádhu	mátari	cha	pitari	cha	susúsá	mitá
D	————	— u	inátá	—	pitá	—	sususa	* *
K	kramayo	sadhu	mata	—	pitushu	—	suśrushra	mitra

G a	sa ^{saututa} suta ⁱ	ñatina	bamhaña	samañánam	sádhu	dánam
G b	sansúta	ñátinam	bahmaño	samañánam	sádhu	dánam
D	* * *	natásu cha	bambhana	sumanchi	sádhu	dáne
K	suta*	na	* * * * *	* * * *	* *	* *

G a	páuánam	sádhu	anárambho	apavyayatá	apabhin ^{il} datá
G b	páuánam	sádhu	anárambho	apavyayatá	apabhin ^{il} datá
D	jivesu	análambha	sádha	apaviyati	apabhan ^{il} datá
K	* * *	* *	* * *	apavayata	apabhidata

G a	sádhu	parisápi	yuto ^o	añapayisati	gañanáyam
G b	sádhu	parisápi	yuto	añapayisati	gañanáyam
D	sadhu	palisápi	cha	* * tiyatani	ñapeyi ta
K	sadhu	parisapa	yutra ni	* * ña ^o chata	ñapeśanti

G a	hetu	to	cha	vyanjano ^a	to	cha
G b	hetu	to	cha	vyanjana	to	cha
D	* tu	to	cha	vá	* *	
K	hatusta	cha	vañana	to	cha	

THE opening of the inscription corresponds with that of Girnar, only substituting ahati, the primitive, although obsolete, third pers. present tense for, áha, the King Priyadasī, &c., says. In place of dwádasa, twelve, and vásá, year, the inscription has bavaya vasha, but the first must be wrong; the second is no doubt correct, corresponding with the vásá, for varsha, year, of the Girnar and Dhauli tablets, although that should properly be, vassá, with a double s, the noun being in the ablative case, from the twelfth year. A long chasm ensues, but the defective passage probably corresponded with that at Girnar, to which rendering no reasonable objection applies; and it is as Mr. Prinsep renders it, this is commanded by me, having been consecrated (or enthroned) twelve years.

The word, vijite, in the conquered (country) corresponds with the Girnar tablet; mama, mine, is omitted without any blank: the omission does not affect the sense. The following sentence nearly corresponds

with that at Girnar, but we have, yota for yote, and rajaki padesīva, for rajuke cha padesake cha. It is probably somewhat inaccurate in this place. Mr. Westergaard corrects, yote to yutá, but the Kapur di Giri inscription confirms the former. Mr. Prinsep identifies, yote with yukte, and interprets it, among the faithful, a meaning that cannot be admitted; it is more likely to be the epithet of, rajuke, especial or own subjects, as opposed to, pradesaka, a foreigner; for panchasu panchasu, we have pa*sha pachashu, no doubt the same reading.

The two following words confirm the reading of the Dhauli inscription, and this is of importance, for they admit of a plausible translation, which cannot be said of the Girnar inscription, either as originally deciphered or as corrected from, anusayinam siyatu, to anusáyinu niyáta, neither of which is intelligible. The Kapur di Giri reading is, anusayanam nikhamatu, "let injunctions be endured or obeyed;" the second word being the Pali form of, nikshamyatu, from kshama, "to bear." As the passive verb, it should properly be, nikshamyatám, but this may be the error of the writer. Anusayanam, has for one sense repentance, but it scarcely seems capable of such a meaning in this place. The following words differ materially from those of the other inscriptions; in some instances they cannot be correct, as kavayo, in place of the kammanc, of Dhauli, but all three inscriptions deviate so much from any thing like grammar, that it is difficult to make sense of the passage; etáye, might be the third case of the feminine pronoun, etá, this; but, etáye, is not found in the Pali grammar; we can only however connect it with, atháya, for artháya, fourth case of, artha, masculine noun, object, meaning; at Kapur di Giri we have, eti sato, or perhaps it should be, atisasa, for, atisayasya, of much, and then, imisa, of this, dharmanusrastaye, falling off from piety, while in the others it is read, dhammánusanstáya, for the establishment of piety. In the Kapur di Giri inscription, again, we have the, sa anaye pi kramaye, that is, through this series, in place of, yathá apoya sí kammáya, corrected to, achoya si kammáya, or possibly, aváya si kammáya; the readings are all untranslatable; all the inscriptions have, sadhu, it is good. They all concur sufficiently in what follows, or as it runs in the Kapur di Giri tablet, matapitushu suśrushra, obedience to parents, mitrasutana, (love of) friends and sons. The inscription then is interrupted and omits much that is found at Girnar, translated by Prinsep, good and proper is service to Brahmans and Sramans; excellent is charity: he omits the next clause, good is non-injury to living beings; and adds, prodigality and malicious slander are

not good. We have in the Kapur di Giri inscription the last words which he has thus rendered as, *apavayata*, and *apabhidata*, for *apavyayatá*, and *apabhindatá*; but they should be preferably rendered in the negative sense, or freedom from extravagance, and absence of censoriousness are good; which obviates the necessity of the violent correction Prinsep was obliged to make in arbitrarily prefixing a negative to, *sadhu*. The Kapur di Giri inscription confirms the rest; it is, *sadhu*, not, *asádhu*, in all.

The remainder of the inscription corresponds nearly with that of Girnar, but does not assist us to make out a probable interpretation; *parisapi yuto*, or, *parisapayutra*, cannot mean, leader of the congregation. It is more probably intended for, *parisarpa yukta*, fit or appropriate progress, followed by the verb in the causal passive, shall be commanded in the enumeration, (at the periods enjoined?) for *gañaná*, has such meaning only, and not the sense of, *gana*, a number or assembly: the word *gañaná* does not occur in our inscription; as to that at Dhauli it is evidently too imperfect to be of any help in this place; *hatusta cha vañana na*, are near enough to, *hetuto cha vyanjanato cha*, although they are both suspicious forms: *vyanjaña*, in Pali or Pankrit should be, *vinjana*.

Subject to considerable doubt, we may propose the following translation of Inscription III.

Proposed Translation.

King Priyadasi says, This was ordered by me when I had been twelve years inaugurated in the conquered country, and among my own subjects as well as strangers, that every five years' expiation should be undergone with this object, for the enforcement of such moral obligations as were declared by me to be good; such as duty to parents, (and protection of) friends, children, (relations, Brahmans and Sramans;) good is liberality, good is non-injury of living creatures, and abstinence from prodigality and slander are good. Continuance in this course,

Mr. Prinsep's Translation.

"Thus spake the heaven-beloved King PRIYADASI:—

"By me after the twelfth year of my anointment, this commandment is made! Everywhere in the conquered (provinces) among the faithful, whether (my own) subjects or foreigners, after every five years, let there be (a public) humiliation for this express object, yea, for the confirmation of virtue and for the suppression of disgraceful acts.

"Good and proper is dutiful service to mother and father; —towards friends and kinsfolks, towards Brahmans and Sramans

(the discharge of these duties) shall be commanded both by explanation and example. excellent is charity :—prodigality and malicious slander are not good.

“All this the leader of the congregation shall inculcate to the assembly, with (appropriate) explanation and example.”

TABLET IV.

G a	'Atikátam	antaram	bahúni	vasasatáni	vaḍhitá	eva
G b	Atikátam	antaram	bahuni	vásasatáni	vaḍhitá	eva
D	Atikantam	antalam	bahúni	vasasatáni	vadhiteva	
K	Atikatam	antaram	bahuni	vashaśatani	vaḍhito	va
G a	páhárambho	vihinsá	cha	bhútánam	ñatisu	'asampatipatí
G b	panarámbha	vihinsá	cha	bhútánam	natisu	asampatipatí
D	pánámbho	vihinsá	cha	bhutánam	nátisu	asampatipati
K	pranarambho	vihisa	cha	bhutanam	ñatinu	asapatipati
G a	bambháa	sámañánam	asampatipatí	^t cha	aja	devánam
G b	báhmāna	samanánam	asampatipatí	ta	aja	devánam
D	samana	* * yesa	asampatipati	se	aja	devánam
K	śramañam	bramanam	sapatipati	tu	aja	devanam
G a	piyasa	Piyadasino	raño	^{nēna} 'dhammacharáganena		
G b	piyasa	Piyadasino	raño	dhammacharañena		
D	piyasa	Piyadasino	lajine	dhammachalanena		
K	priya*	* * * *	* * *	*dhamacharañena		
G a	bheríghoso	^{ho} api	dhammaghoso	vimana	dapañá	cha
G b	narighoso	aho	dhammaghoso	vimána	dasaná	cha
D	bhelighosam	api	dhammaghosam	vimána	dasanam	—
K	bherigosha	aha	dhamagosha	vimanena	daśanena	—
G a	^t hassi	dapañá	cha	'agikhandáni	cha	añáni —
G b	hastí	dasaná	cha	agikhandáni	cha	añáni cha
D	hathíni	—	—	agakhandháni	—	annáni cha
K	nēna	—	—	netikadhani	—	añani cha

G a	divyáni	—	rúpáni	dasayi	["] pajanam	yárisa
G b	divyani	—	rupáni	dasayi	pujanam	yárisa
D	diviyáni		lúpánam	dasayitu	munisánam	ádise
K	divani	*tam	* pani	danśayitu	janasa	yadiśam

G a	bahú	hi	vasa	satehi	["] na	bhúta	puve	tárise	aja
G b	bahu	hi	vasa	satehi	na	bhúta	puve	tárise	aja
D	bahú	—	vasa	satehi	no	húta	pulve	tádise	aja
K	bahu	hi	vasha	śatehi	na	bhuta	purve	tadise	aja

G a	vaḍhitá	^o devánam	piyasa	Piyadasino	ráño	dhammánu-
G b	vaḍhite	devánam	piyasa	Piyadasino	raño	dhammánu-
D	vudha	devánam	piyasa	Piyadasine	lájine	dhammanu-
K	vaḍhite	devanam	priyasa	Priyadaśisa	raño	dhamanu-

G a	sanstiyá	anáram ["] bho	pánánam	avihinsá	bhutánam
G b	sastiyá	anárambho	pánánam	avihisá	bhútánam
D	sathiyá	anachambhe	pánánam	avihinsá	bhutánam
K	sanstaya	anaram * *	* nanaui	avihisa	bhatana

		^t			
G a	ñátinam	sampatipatí	bámhaña	samañánam	
G b	ñátinam	sampatipatí	bamhana	samanánam	
D	ñatisu	sampatipati	samana	bábhanesu	
K	ñanasa	* * * *	* * *	*sramañanam	

	^t					
G a	sampatipatí	mátari	pitari	⁷ susúsá	thaire	susúsá
G b	sampatipatí	mátari	pitari	susúsá	thairi	susúsá
D	sampatipati	máta	pitu	susúsám	va	susúsá
K	sapatipati	mata	pita	shu tu	ara	suśrusha

G a	esa	año	cha	bahuvidhe	dhammacharaña
G b	esa	año	cha	bahuvidho	dhammacharañe
D	esa	anne	cha	bahuvidho	dhammachalane
K	esam	iña	cha	bahuvadham	dhamacharañam

G a	vaḍhita	^o vaḍhayisati	cheva	devánam	piyo	["] Piyadasi
G b	vaḍhite	vaḍhayisati	cheva	devánam	piyo	Piyadasi
D	vaḍhite	vaḍhayisati	cheva	devánam	piye	Piya * *
K	vaḍhitam	* vaḍhiśati	chayo	devanam	priyasa	Priyadaśisa

G a	rájá	dhammacharañam	idam	putá	cha	potá	cha
G b	rájá	dhammacharañam	idam	putá	cha	potá	cha
D	lāja	dhammachalanam	imam	putápi	cha	nati	*
K	raño	dhammacharañam	ime	putrapi	cha	kunatavo	cha

G a	papotá	cha	devánam	piyasa	Piyadasino	raño
G b	papotá	cha	devánam	piyasa	Piyadasino	raño
D	*	*	devánam	piyasa	Piyadasino	lajine
K	pranatika	cha	devanam	priyasa	Priyadaśisa	raña

G a	*vadhayisanti	idam	dhammacharañam	á	va	^{sa} pavata
G b	vadhayisanti	idam	dhammacharañam	á	va	savata
D	pavādhayisanti	yeva	dhammachalanam	imam	—	—
K	vadhisánti	* *	* * * *	icha		pavata

G a	kapá	dhammamhi	sīlamhi	tistantó	imam
G b	kapá	dhammamhi	sīlamhi	tistanto	dhammam
D	akepaun	dhammasi	sīlasi	bhavisitu	* * *
K	kapa	dhamasīla	* * *	*ti * mato	dhamma

G a	anusásisanti	¹⁰ esa	hise	^{ste} te	^{mm} kame	yathá
G b	anusásisanti	esa	hise	^{ste}	kamme	ya
D	sasisanti	esa	hise	*	* me	yá
K	ánusaśisanti	eva	esa	*	—	yuta

G a	^{dhamm} anusásana ^m	dhammacharañe	pi	na	bhavati
G b	dhammánusásanam	dhammacharañe	pi	na	bhavati
D	dhammánusásana	dhammachalana	pi	cha	no hoti
K	— nusásana	dhamacharana	pi	cha	na bhoti

G a	asila	sava	imamhi	athamhi	¹¹ dhi	cha	ahíní	cha
G b	asila	sava	imamhi	athamhi	*dhi	cha	ahíní	cha
D	asilasa	se	inasa	athasa	vādhi	—	ahini	(lha
K	asīlasa	se	imisu	atasa	vādhi	—	ahini	cha

G a	sádhu	etáya	atháya	idam	ⁱ likhapitam	inasa	^{atha} athasa
G b	sádhu	etáya	athá*ya	ida	lekhápitam	inasa	athasa
D	sáya	*tá *	a * iya	—	likhite	inasa	athasa
K	sadhu	ethayo	athaye	ima	lipitam	inisa	athasa

G a	vadbaya	jantu	híni	^{cha} *	^{avyá} lochetaṃ rha	dwádasa
G b	* dháyu	jantu	híni	<i>mu</i>	lochetaṃvyá	dwádasa
D	vādh,yun	jantu	híni	<i>cha</i>	má alochayi	duvádasa
K	vādhiya	jantu	híni	<i>cha</i>	mahigava	rana
G a	vasá	bhisitena	devānam	piyena	Piyadasinā	rāño
G b	vásá	bhisitena	devānam	piyena	Piyadasinā	rañá
D	vasáni	abhisitasa	devānam	piyása	Piyadasine	lājine
K	vasha	bhisitena	devanam	priyasa	Priyadaśisa	raña
G a	idam	lekhápitam				
G b	idam	lekhápitam				
D	ya sa	likhite				
K	idam	lipikhatam				

THE Kapur di Giri inscription agrees exactly with that of Girnar in the opening passage, and may be rendered, a period is passed of many hundred years (during which) have augmented the destruction of life, the injury of creatures, irreverence to relatives, and irreverence of Brahmans and Sramans; differing in this last clause not only by putting Sramana first, like the Dhauli inscription, as Sramana braṃmanam, instead of Bálmaña-samañánam, as at Girnar, but by retaining the conjunct, r, and keeping the words separate, or Sramañam Brahmanam: we may therefore admit, that the religious mendicants, called, Sramans, are intended as well as, Brahmans, or the sense of the Girnar tablet might be applied to one class of persons only, or Brahman mendicants; that is to say, Brahmans leading a religious not a secular life; for although Sramana is usually applied to Buddhist teachers, yet in its original import it designates any ascetic or religious character. The reading, sapatipati, where that term is repeated, is no doubt an error, either of the original or copy, the negative prefix being omitted.

The inscriptions follow the same tenor in the ensuing passage, with a slight blank in the name of the prince at Kapur di Giri: the next word, dharmacharañena, confirms the corrected reading of Girnar; also, charañena, not, charáganena, as read by Mr. Prinsep. and rendered by him, by the messenger of the religion of the king. It is rather by or in conformity to King Piyadasi in adherence to the laws of duty, this day a pious proclamation, &c., is made; the participle, vādHITE, apparently supplying the verbal copulative of the sentence, although suspended for an unusual interval.

The sense of what follows is not very obvious, and we have some

irreconcilable differences here, which do not diminish the uncertainty. Instead of, *vimāna dasanā*, (to which, *dapana*, the first reading, has been corrected,) we have, *vimanena daśanena*, and in place of, *hasti-dasanā*, we have what reads like *nena*; and *neti kadchani*, for, *agi khandāni*,—none of which furnish a probable signification. We may acquiesce in the possibility that a procession of cars and elephants is intended, but we cannot accede to Mr. Prinsep's addition, of things to gratify the senses, the meaning he conjectures of,—as he reads it, —*aga*, (*anga*) *khandāni*. The correct reading, however, is, *agi khandāni*,—the title he tells us of one of Buddha's discourses,—receiving a heap of fire. This is not quite correct, however, for the denomination is, *aggi khandopamā*, and is connected with the designation of, *Sutra*. Precepts similar to a heap of fire; an epithet perhaps rather than a title. *Agi*, more correctly, *aggi*, may be the Pali form of, *agni*, fire, and, *khandāni*, is good Sanskrit for parts, or portions. If the reading be accurate, we might rather be disposed to explain it fire-works, which with carriages and elephants were designed to do honour to the Raja's proclamation. The whole passage, however, is of a very questionable purport, and cannot be translated at all with any degree of confidence. The part immediately ensuing is more intelligible, and is of value, as while confirming the sense of the Girnar inscription, it corrects the corrected version. Mr. Westergaard reads, *pujanam*, worshipping, instead of Prinsep's, *pajānam*, of people; the equivalent of this is, *manisānam*, of men, at *Dhauri*, and, *janasa*, of men or people, at *Kapur di Giri*. *Pujanam*, therefore, must be wrong, and the reading of Girnar should no doubt be, *pajānam*,—for, *prajānām*, from, *prajā*, subjects or people. The sense of the passage is pretty much the same as that given by Prinsep,—and other wonderful appearances (shall be exhibited) to the people looking on, such as have never before been for hundreds of years.

The language of the inscription at *Kapur di Giri* continues to correspond with that of *Girnar*; a few defects occur, but they may be readily supplied, and the translation of Mr. Prinsep be followed with little alteration, through the establishment of duty by king *Piyadasi*, &c., non-sacrifice of living beings, non-injury of creatures, reverence to kindred, respect for *Sramans* and *Brahmans*—obedience to father and mother, obedience to elders, these and various other moral duties increase and shall increase. Unluckily the letters which should be equivalent to the, *thaira*, of *Girnar*, are too equivocal to explain that term. Mr. Prinsep considers it to be the *thero* of the *Mahavanso*, which is not impossible, for that word in Pali merely means aged.

old, being a corruption of, *sthavira*, having the same sense, and to which the Girnar, *tha-i-ra*, presents a still closer resemblance.

This moral edict of King Priyadasi, his sons and grandsons are to observe;—we have in the Kapur di Giri inscription some inaccuracies here, but the words intended are probably, *nāti*, and, *pranāti*, for, *naptá*, and, *pranaptá*, grandson, and great-grandson, which appear to have been used also at Dhauli, instead of, *potá*, and, *prapotá*.

Mr. Prinsep's reading of the following words in the Girnar tablet is, *á eva pavata kapá*,—which he proposes to render—as long as the mountains shall endure. The correction of Mr. Westergaard has, *savata kapa*,—a more probable reading—implying, through all kalpas (or ages). In the Kapur di Giri tablet, however, it is, *pavata kapa*,—and may imply,—like a mountain,—*kapa*, for, *kalpa*, implying, similitude, when compounded with a preceding term. The letters before it are, *i-cha*, not, *á-cha*—but they follow a blank to which *i*, perhaps, belongs. *Dhamasila* follows,—omitting the case terminations of the Girnar inscription,—*dhammamhi silamhi*—we have only distinctly, *ti*, for the, *tishtanto*, of Girnar, but the letters may be intended for the same, *tishtatu*, and the whole passage mean, Let the virtuous ordinance of Piyadasi endure as a mountain for the establishment of duty.

The obscurity of the concluding portion of the edict remarked by Mr. Prinsep, is scarcely illuminated by the document of Kapur di Giri,—there is a general conformity, but there are several imperfections. Mr. Prinsep's rendering seems to have omitted the two next words, *dhamma anusásisati*, and proceeds,—“Through good acts of this nature, (i.e., through these ordinances) and the strict practice of religion, laxness of discipline is obviated. Moreover, in this object it is proper to be intelligent, and nowise neglectful.” A less exceptionable translation may be conjectured by connecting the two words omitted with the third, *esa hise*, or in our tablet, *eva esa*, for, *eva-eshu*, or, *eteshu*. Duty will be established in those (acts,—reverence for parents, &c.) The next word is a blank in our inscription, and it is not clear what it should be in the others;—*ste kamme ya*,—for, *ya*, we have, *yu*, but that is possibly an error. If we take the words before *kamme*, for the relative pronouns, *te*, and, *ye*, for, *táni*, and, *yáni*, and, *kamma*, as the representative of, *karmáni*, and regard *dharmanusasam*, and, *dharmacharanam*, as contrasted,—the whole passage may have this import,—“Duty will be established by these (moral acts), for the law which directs ceremonial rites is not the observance of moral duties.” The latter part of the clause is even, if possible,

more obscure,—asila, however, is preferably connected with what follows than with what precedes, and rather denotes a person of ill-conduct than laxness of religion. Instead of Prinsep's unintelligible dhi, we have, vadhi,—with the Dhauli inscription. Ahini, may possibly be intended for, adhini, subject to, and the whole may mean,—“It were well for every ill-conducted person to be subject (or attentive) to this purpose, or the object of this injunction.” The whole being intended to raise moral duty above ceremonial rites.

In the next passage, we have, imam lipi or lipatam, for, idam likhapitam. This writing, instead of, this has been caused to be written.

The next words are also obscure ; they may perhaps mean,—“Let not any thought be entertained by the subject people of opposing this edict,” although, jantu, rather means an animal than people and the sense of, hini, is questionable. Mr. Prinsep renders it, “Let all take heed to profit of this good object, and not to give utterance to objections.”

The concluding phrase of the Kapur di Giri tablet agrees precisely with that of Girnar, except that there is a blank in the place of the number. In place of, Priyadaśinā in the third case we have, however, the sixth or genitive, Priyadaśisa, conforming to the genitive, priyasa, which is the reading at Dhauli. The difference is immaterial to the sense. “This has been caused to be written by King Piyadasi,—having been (twelve) years inaugurated.”

The entire translation, agreeably to the foregoing remarks, and subject to correction, may be thus given.

Proposed Translation.

“During a past period of many centuries, there have prevailed destruction of life, injury of living beings, disrespect towards kindred, and irreverence towards Sramans and Brahmans. But now, in conformity to moral duty, the pious proclamation of King Priyadasi, the beloved of the gods, is made by beat of drum, in a manner never before performed for hundreds of years, with chariot and elephant processions, and fireworks, and other divine

Mr. Prinsep's Translation.

“In times past, even for many hundred years, has been practised the sacrifice of living beings, the slaughter of animals, disregard of relations ; and disrespect towards Brahmans and Sramans :—This day, by the messenger of the religion of the heaven-beloved King Piyadasi, (has been made) a proclamation by beat of drum, a grand announcement of religious grace, and a display of equipages, and a parade of elephants, and things to gratify the

displays of the people exhibiting the ceremonies—(and this) for the promulgation of the law of King Priyadasi, &c., that non-destruction of life, non-injury to living beings, respect to relations, reverence of Brahmans and Sramans, and many other duties, do increase, and shall increase, and this moral law of the King Priyadasi, the sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons, of King Priyadasi shall maintain. Let the moral ordinance of King Priyadasi be stable as a mountain for the establishment of duty, for in these actions duty will be followed, as the law which directs ceremonial rites is not the observance of moral duties. It were well for every ill-conducted person to be attentive to the object of this injunction. This is the edict (writing) of King Priyadasi. Let not any thought be entertained by the subject people of opposing the edict. This has been caused to be written by the King Priyadasi, in the twelfth year of his inauguration."

senses, and every other kind of heavenly object for the admiration of mankind, such as had never been for many hundred years such as were to-day exhibited.

"By the religious ordinance of the heaven-beloved King PIYADASI, the non-sacrifice of animals, the non-destruction of living beings, proper regard to kindred, respect to brahmans and sramans, dutiful service to father and mother, dutiful service to spiritual pastors :—through these and many other similar (good acts) doth religious grace abound ; and thus moreover shall the heaven-beloved King PIYADASI cause religion to flourish : and the same shall the sons, the grandsons, and the great-grandsons of the heaven-beloved King PIYADASI cause to abound exceedingly.

"As long as the mountains shall endure, so long in virtue, and in strict observances shall the religion stand fast. And though good acts of this nature, that is to say,—through these ordinances, and the strict practice of religion, laxness of discipline is obviated. Moreover in this object, it is proper to be intelligent, and no-wise neglected. For the same purpose is this (edict) ordered to be written. Let all take heed to profit of this good object, and not to give utterance to objections.

"By the heaven-beloved King PIYADASI, after the twelfth year of his anointment is this caused to be written."

TABLET V.

G a	'Devánam	piya ^o	Piyadasi	rájá	evam	áha	kaláña
G b	Devánam	piyo	Piyadasi	rájá	evam	áha	kaláña
D	Devánam	piya	Piyadasí	lāja	hevam	áhá	kayáno
K	"Devanam	priya	Priyadaśi	rāyo	evam	ahati	dekayāña

G a	dakaraya	a	*	*	kaláño	papo ^{sase}	dukara ^m	karoti	'ta	mayá
G b	dakaranye	a	*	*	kaláño	saso	dukaram	karoti	ta	mayá
D	dukalo	*	*	*	kayáná	sase	dukalam	kaleti	so	mo
K	dakara	na	la	pa	cha	so	daśara	karoti	so	maya

G a	bahu	kaláña	kata	ta	mama	putá	cha
G b	bahu	kaláñam	kata	ta	mama	putá	cha
D	bahuke	kayáná	kaṭe	gam	ye	me	* pu *
K	bahu	kalaña	kata	—	maha	putra	chan

G a	potá	cha	parecha	tanayá	mo	* * *	rapacha
G b	potá	cha	parancha	tenaya	mo	apacham	
D	naga	*	* * * cha	tanaye	apatiye	me	
K	vata	cha	cha	parancha	tanaya	mo	apacha

G a	áva	pavata ^{samvāta}	kapá	anuvatasare	tathá	'so
G b	áva	samvanta	kapá	anuvatisare	tathá	so
D	áva	—	kapam	tathá	anuvatisanta	sa
K	amanti	ava	kapam	tatha	ye	anavatisanti to

G a	sukatam	kásatí	yo	tu	ete ^a	desam	pihapeyati ^{sá}
G b	sukatam	kásati	yo	tu	eta	desam	pihápēsati
D	sákatam	kachhati	—	eho	ta	desam	pihápāyisati
K	sakita	kusati	yo	cha	ati	deśam	prihapivaka

G a	so	dukatam	kásatí	sukaram ^{hi}	papo ^{am}	atikátam
G b	so	dukatam	kásati	sukaramhi	pápam	atikátam
D	se	dukatam	káchhati	pápeha	supudálayesu	atikantam
K	sa	hakatam	kushanti	papamha	sahane	atikatam

G a	antaram	'na	bhúta	puvam	dhamma	mahámátá
G b	antaram	na	bhúta	puvam	dhamma	mahámátá
D	antalam	no	húta	puluvá	dhamma	mahamátá
K	antaram	na	bhuta	puva	dhama	mahamatam

G a	náma	—	me ^{to} yá	to	dasa	vasá	bhisitena	—
G b	náma	ta	me ^{to} yá	to	dasa	vásá	bhisitena	—
D	náma	se		to	dasa	* sa	bhisitena	ma
K	nama	so	ti	*	* *	vasha	bhisitena	¹² ya

G a	dhamma	mahá	mátá	——	kata	to	—	sava
G b	dhamma	mahá	mátá	——	katá	te	—	sava
D	dhamma	mahá	mátá	náma	kata	to	sato	sava
K	dhamā	maha	matra	——	kita	te	—	savo

			dhistanāyam					
G a	pásandesu	vyápatá	dhamma majunaya	*	*	*	*	*
G b	pásandesu	vyápatá	dhammadhistánáyā	*	*	*	*	*
D	pásandesu	vīyapa	dhammádhitánáyē					dhammavādhiyo
K	pashandeshu	—————	dhamadhithayo cha					dhamavadhiya

G a	dhamma	^y sutasa	cha	—	^{yo} na	Kambo(cha)
G b	dhamma	yutasa	cha	—	yoña	Kambo *
D	hita	sukháyo	cha	dharmasutá	sanyána	Kambocha
K	hita	sukhaya	cha	dhama	yathasaya	Kambayi

G a	Gandhára	————	Naristika	Piteúikána ^{nam}	yo
G b	Gandhára	————	Naristika	Peteúíkáuam	ye
D	Gan, * * le	————	Suláthika	Pitenike sa	li
K	Gandharanam	* * *	* ristakanam	Pitinikanam	ta

G a	vápi	añas	ápará	tá	bhatamayesu	va	*(pita	su)
G b	vápi	anño	ápará	tá	bhatamayesu	va	* *	*
D	vápi	anno	ápalantá		bhati*	* *	*	babhaní
K	vapi	—	apatara		bhatamayashu		bramani	bhishu

G α	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
G β	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
D	anathesu					ma					lokesu cha hota				
K	anateshu					vatashu					bita				

G a	khá	ya	va	*	dhamma	yutánam	apará	go	dháya
G b	khá	*	*	*	* *	mayutána	apará	go	dháya
D	bhisásu		sukháye		dharmayutayo		apali	ba	dhaye
K	—		sukhaye		dharmayutasa		apati	ga	dhra

G a	vyápatá	te	bandhana	badhasa	patividhánáya	7 * *
G b	vyápati	te	bandhana	badhasa	patividhánáya	* *
D	viyapatá	se	bandhanam	*dhasasa	* * ye	apa-
K	vapata	te	¹³ bandhanam	badhasa	patividhanayo	apa-

G a	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
G b	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
D	libodhaye	mokhaye	cha	*	iya	anubandha	pajati							
K	narodhaye	mocha	——		vana	va	* * *	pajati						

G a	já	katá	bhikaresu	vá	thairesu	vá	vyapátá
G b	ja	katá	bhikaresu	vá	thairesu	vá	vyápatá
D	*	* ta	bhikala	va	mahálakenti	va	viyápatá
K	—	kita	bhikati	va	mahalaka	va	viyapata

G a	^{to} to	Pátaliputo	cha	^k bahiresu	cha	**	*	*	*	*	*
G b	to	Pátalipute	cha	báhi* su	cha	*	*	*	*	*	*
D	eo	—— hida	cha	báhilesu	cha	nagalesu	savesu				
K	*	—— cha	——	bahireshu	cha	nagareshu	saveshu				

G a	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
G b	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
D	olodhancsu	eváhi	bhátanam	——	me	——	* * *										
K	orodhancshu	——	bhratuna	cha	me	kusuna	cha	ye									

G a	*	*	*	*	vápi	——	año	ñatika	——
G b	*	*	*	*	ne vápi	me	año	ñatiká	——
D	bhaghininam	va	——	annesu	——	sa*ti			
K	——	vapi	——	año	ñatika	——			

G a	savata	vyápatá	te	yo	ayam	^{dhammanistito} dha*penūasito
G b	savatá	vyápatá	te	yo	ayam	dhammanistito
D	sávatatam	vayapatá	o		iyam	dhammanisita
K	savatam	viyapata	yo	vayo	——	dhamanistiśita

G a	táva	**	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
G b	tíva	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
D	tivam	dhammádhithine	táva	dánasayute	va	sava								
K	tivara	dhamadhitano	diva	danasayutra	va	*								

G a	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
G b	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
D	pathaviyam				_____				dhammayutasi				_____	
K	*	*	*		asti	stanati	mata		dhamayatasa	*		vaña		
G b		*	*	*	*	dhammamahāmātā		etāya	athāya		āyam			
G a		*	*	*	*	dhammamahāmātā		etāya	athaya		ayam			
D		viyapatā		imo		dhammamahāmātā		imāyo	athāyo		iyam			
K		viyapatra		e		dhamamahamatra		itayo	athaya		ayo			
G a		dhammalipi		likhitā		_____		_____						
G b		dhammalipi		likhitā		_____		_____						
D		dhammalipāli			sansa	chilathiti		kata	tasa	cha	me			
K		dhamalipi		lipi	*	_____		thiti	va	tinika	bhota			
G a		_____												
G b		_____												
D		pa	*	anavetatu										
K		panja		anuvatantu										

THE inscription opens with the same phrase as those of Girnar and Dhauli,—the king, &c., thus says,—substituting, abati, as before, for, āha, and it proceeds to the same purport, although it does not assist in removing the difficulty of interpretation experienced by Mr. Prinsep in regard to the corresponding passage. It is most in accordance with the Dhauli inscription, giving, kayana, for, kalana, good; but this word is preceded by a character exactly the same as the, de, of, deva,—the purport of which is questionable. There are some other doubtful syllables in, na la pa, but the other words are much the same. They offer also, as noticed by Mr. Prinsep, an analogy to a passage on the Delhi Lat, and possibly express the same sentiment, namely:—"He that perverts good to evil, will reap evil from good,"—but the obvious inaccuracies and deficiencies of the inscription render this liable to question.

The next few words are the same, kalana, being here used for, kāyana. We then have variations, but they are possibly of transcript rather than of design, as, maha puta chan data cha, should very probably be the, mama putā cha potā cha, of Girnar. The next words agree with, apacha, for, apatya, progeny. Instead of, āva savata kapa—or, avasamvanta kapa, the corrected reading of Girnar, we have in the first place a word which is uncertain, for the power of the initial letter is not ascertained,—it sometimes appears as t, but

it bears a nearer affinity to, a, with the addition of a cross bar at the foot. We may guess it to be intended for, am, and read the word, ammanti, for, anumanyante, they obey or assent to; ava kapam, for, samvanta kapá follows. For the words anuvatisare tathá, we have tatha ye anavatisanti, confirming the Dhauli reading, anuvatisanta—for anuvarttishyante—so they who shall follow or imitate them—they shall obtain or attract good; sukita kusati, for, sukatam kásati, or, karshati, as proposed in the explanation of Tablet VII., published on a former occasion. The following sentence is evidently intended to be the same in the three inscriptions, but the word, prihapivaka, is less likely to be correct, perhaps, than the, pihápesati, of Girnar, although the latter is not very intelligible: hakatam, also, although distinct enough, is possibly an error for the, dukatam, of the other inscriptions,—the sense of the passage can be but very vaguely guessed at, although it may mean, and he who transgresses the rule shall suffer misfortune. The reading of Kapur di Giri, papamha sahane, may be thought more satisfactory than that of Girnar, sukaramhi pápam, the purport of which it is difficult to conjecture, as we may connect it with, mahámátá, for, mahamátra, the great minister, and render the whole, the chief minister of the law has for an unprecedentedly long time been endurant of the occurrence of wickedness; therefore, the inscription continues, in the tenth year of the inauguration, supervisors of moral law are appointed by me;—the word, dasá, ten, is unfortunately obliterated; but as the rest corresponds with the Girnar text, and the space is that of a short dissyllabic word,—we may infer that it had a place in Kapur di Giri.

The term, majunaya, which Mr. Prinsep conjectured to be intended for, majjana, drowning, is corrected by Mr. Westergaard to, dhisthánaya, or with dhamma preceding it, dhammadhisthánáya for dharma-dhisthánáya.—This is confirmed by the Kapur di Giri tablet, which has dhammadhithaya,—omitting incorrectly one syllable. This correction makes the meaning of the passage clear enough. It has nothing to do with overwhelming believers, but is simply,—In the tenth year ministers of morals were appointed by me, for the purpose of presiding over moral law among all the religionists; pashanda, signifying the follower of any religion—not heretic, as will be subsequently shewn. We have an additional clause here, as well as at Dhauli, there being a flaw in the rock at Girnar, dhamma vádhiya hita sukháye cha, which may be rendered, and for the encouragement of those disposed to observe the moral law. The countries in which the followers of various religions are to be found, are apparently named in the Kapur di Giri inscription as, Kambaya, Gandhára,

—ristaka and Pitinika, agreeing apparently with Girnar and Dhauli, in the two first and the fourth. The third name is defective, wanting the first three or four letters, but the latter part might be read, ristakanam,—and the whole may be therefore, Naristakanam,—equivalent to the, Naristike, of Girnar. In the latter the termination of the genitive plural is confined to the last of the four names, treating them as one compound. In the Kapur di Giri inscription, we have each name in the genitive plural, except the first, which is in the nominative singular—a matter of no consequence in the document. The corrected copy of the Girnar inscription appears to prefix, youa, to the rest, instead of, yena, as at first read. Kamboja, and, Gandhara, are now fully identified as countries in the north-west of India, but the other names have not been met with elsewhere.

In the following passage we have additional readings as in the Dhauli inscription, arising apparently from some mutilation of the Girnar tablet, in the left angle of all except the four first lines; a circumstance not noticed by Mr. Prinsep, although in consequence of the difference between them he gives separate translations. Except, however, where these defects occur, the passages appear to be intended for the same, and are equally unsatisfactory and obscure. The general sense may be conjectured, and the ministers of morality are apparently enjoined to promote the happiness of the well-disposed among — what may be intended for classes, bhatamayesu, consisting of the military, Bramani bhishu, Brahmans and mendicants, for bhikshushu, anathesu, for anartheshu, or anátheshu, those who are destitute, and vatashu, for which no satisfactory meaning can be proposed.

The following terms, apatiga dhra vapata to, correspond with the, apalibadháye viyapatá, of Dhauli, and aparágodháya vyápati, of Girnar, all puzzling enough, and certainly not meaning, not within knowledge or restraint of passion, as proposed by Mr. Prinsep. We may conjecture them representing, apratignatah vyapyeyu, may spread abroad without impediment; but this is mere conjecture. The next phrase is more intelligible, for removing the bondage of the bound: the next is clearly incorrect; but it is probably intended to express something of the same purport, for the liberation of those who are obstructed. The continuation corresponds pretty nearly with the Dhauli inscription, and may mean that holy science may be inculcated amongst the mendicants, or amongst the mighty; but the construction is very defective. The Kapur di Giri inscription agrees with that of Dhauli in omitting the word, Pátálipute, found at Girnar;

nor have we any term corresponding to, hida, here, in this place. We have, bahiresu, for the, bahilesu, of Dhauli, and, báhiresu, of Girnar, which, though barbarous, may be intended for, bahishu, outer or foreign; followed by, nagaresu saveshu olodhaneshu (avarodhaneshu), in all cities and fortresses, words defective at Girnar.

We next have, bhratuna, corresponding with the bhatanam, of Dhauli, but with the addition of me, of my brother, and being in the singular instead of the plural; also, kusuna, corresponding with, bhaginam, with the same difference of number; the word itself being also probably an error for, Sasuna, the Pali of, Swasri, sister: here also we have the personal pronoun, and we may understand that the king extends his injunctions to the districts governed by his brother and his sister, or as the text proceeds, any other of his relations; the injunction is to be every where circulated.

The following passages conform to the tenor of the Dhauli inscription, but with variations ascribable to defects in both, either in the original or the transcripts; something like an approach to meaning may however be made out, and without any assistance from Girnar, in which a flaw partially occurs; but there is apparently an injunction, that the ministers of morals, those who are appointed as superintendents of morals, (Dhammadhitina, Dharmadhistháyinah,) shall wherever the moral law is established give encouragement to the charitable and well-disposed. The Girnar inscription ends with the remark, For this purpose this moral edict is written, which at Dhauli is continued by what Mr. Prinsep renders with apparent correctness, let my people obey it, *tasa cha me pa (ja) anavetatu*; which appears in the less intelligible form of, *va tinika bhota panja anuvatanu*; the sense is possibly the same, and so may be the text if rightly rendered. We may now propose the following version of this tablet, subject to very great reservation, of which a comparison with Mr. Prinsep's version will sufficiently evince the necessity.

Proposed Translation.

The beloved of the gods King Priyadasi thus proclaims: who ever perverts good to evil will derive evil from good, therefore much good has been done by me and my sons, and grandsons, and others my posterity (will) conform

Mr. Prinsep's Translation.

"Thus spake the heaven-beloved King PRIYADASI:—

"Prosperity (cometh) through adversity, and truly each man (to obtain) prosperity causeth himself present difficulty—therefore by me (nevertheless) has much pros-

to it for every age. So they who shall imitate them shall enjoy happiness, and those who cause the path to be abandoned shall suffer misfortune. The chief ministers of morality have for an unprecedently long time been tolerant of iniquity, therefore in the tenth year of the inauguration have ministers of morality been made, who are appointed for the purpose of presiding over morals among persons of all the religions for the sake of the augmentation of virtue, and for the happiness of the virtuous among the people of, Kamboja, Gandhara, Naristaka, and Pitinika. They shall also be spread among the warriors, the Brahmans, the mendicants, the destitute, and others, without any obstruction, for the happiness of the well-disposed in order to loosen the bonds of those who are bound, and liberate those who are confined, through the means of holy wisdom disseminated by pious teachers, and they will proceed to the outer cities and fastnesses of my brother and sister, and wherever are any other of my kindred: and the ministers of morals, those who are appointed as superintendents of morals, shall wherever the moral law is established, give encouragement to the charitable and those addicted to virtue. With this intent this edict is written, and let my people obey it.

perity been brought about, and therefore shall my sons, and my grandsons, and my latest posterity, as long as the very hills endure, pursue the same conduct; and so shall each meet his reward! While he, on the other hand, who shall neglect such conduct,—shall meet his punishment in the midst of the wicked [in the nethermost regions of hell].

“For a very long period of time there have been no ministers of religion properly so called. By myself, then, in this tenth year of mine anointment, are ministers of religion appointed*; who, intermingling among all unbelievers (may overwhelm them) with the inundation of religion, and with the abundance of the sacred doctrines. Through *Kam (bocha, gan) dhāra, narāstika, Petenika*, and elsewhere finding their way unto the uttermost limits of the barbarian countries, for the benefit and pleasure of (all classes) and for restraining the passions of the faithful, and for the regeneration of those bound in the fetters (of sin?) are they appointed. Intermingling equally among the dreaded, and among the respected—both in *Pātālīputa* and in foreign places, teaching better things shall they everywhere penetrate; so that they even who (oppose the faith shall at length become) ministers of it.”

The Cuttack version of the Fifth Tablet, from the star.

—who shall be intermingled with all the hundred grades of unbelievers for the establishment among them of the faith, for the increase of religion, and for their profit and gratification through the context of the sacred doctrines, in *Kambocha* and *Gandhāra*, in *Surāstrika* and *Pitenika*, . . . and even to the furthest (limits) of the barbarian (countries). Who shall mix with the *Brahmans* and *Bhikshus*, with the poor and with the rich,—for their benefit and pleasure, to bring them unto the righteousness which passeth knowledge; and for those bound in the fetters (of sin) this new bond of precious knowledge is made for their final emancipation which is beyond understanding: and among the terrible and the powerful shall they be mixed both here and in foreign countries, in every town, and among all the kindred ties even of brotherhood and sisterhood, and others . . . everywhere! and here also having penetrated, for there is religious darkness (?) even in the very metropolis of religion, every question shall be asked among the charitable, and these being themselves absorbed in righteousness, shall become ministers of the faith(?). For this express reason is this religious edict promulgated; for ever more let my people pay attention thereto!

TABLET VI.

G a	Devānam	piya	Piyadasi]	rājā	evam	āha	atikātam
G b	* * *	* *	* * *si	rājā	evam	āha	atikātam
D	Devānam	piyo	Piyadasi	lāja	hevam	ahā	atikanta
K	Devanam	priyo	Priyadaśi	raya	evam	abati	atikatam

G a	antaram	na	bhuta	puva	sa *	* *	atha	kamme
G b	antaram	na	bhūta	puva	sa *	* la	atha	kamme
D	* * lam	na	hūta	puluvo	savam	kālam	atha	kamme
K	antaram	na	bhuta	puva	sava	kala	* * *	* *

G a	va	pativedanā	vā	ta	mayā ^m	eva	katam	save	kālo
G b	va	pativedanā	vā	ta	mayā	evam	katam	save	kāle
D	va	pativedanā	tā	se	ma	mayā	kate	sa *	* *
K	va	pativedana	ta	—	mayā	eva	kita	savam	kalam

G a	bhunjamāna	samo	—	ūrodhanamhi	gabhāgāramhi
G b	bhunjamāna	samo	—	orodhanamhi	gabhagāramhi
D	* * *	samo	ate	olodhanasi	gabhatapasi
K	cśimana	samo	—	orodhanasi	gabhagarasi

G a	vachamhi	va	vinītamhi	cha	uyānesu	cha	savata
G b	vachamhi	va	vinītamhi	cha	uyānesu	cha	savata
D	* * *	*	vinītasi	—	uyenaja	*	savata
K	vachasi	—	vinatasi	—	nyanasi	—	savatra

G a	pativedaká	stítá	athe	me	janasa	spativedetha	—	iti
G b	pativedaká	stítá	athe	me	janasa	pativedetha	—	iti
D	pativedaká	—	janasa	atham	pativedayantu	ma	ti	
K	prativedaka	—	atha	—	janasa	prativedeka	me	—

G	savata	cha	janasa	athe	karomi	ya	————	cha
G b	savata	cha	janasa	athe	karomi	ya	————	cha
D	sa*	cha	já*	sa	atbám	kalámi	tra	ha ampi cha
K	savatra	cha	janasa	atha	karomi	yapi	—	roki ka

G a	kinchi	mukhato	añapayámi	swayam	mayá	dapakam	vá	
G b	kinchi	mukhatá	añapayámi	swayam	mayá	dapakam	vá	
D	kichhi	makháta	anapeyami	—	—	dapakam	vá	
K	—	makhata	anapayámi	* * *	[	* pika	va	

G a	stavápakam	vá	yavá	puna	—	maháthetesu	—	
G b	sávápakam	vá	yavá	puna	—	maháthatesu	—	
D	savakam	vá	eva	mahá	—	ma *	—	
K	—	—	eva	dhayaka	pi	nama *	tadhava	

G a	ácháyika	añapita	bhavati	otáya	atháya	vivido	ni	
G b	ácháyika	aropitam	bhavati	táya	atháya	vivado	ni	
D	atíyáyike	alopite	hoti	tasi	athasi	vade	vani	
K	achayika	ñā* nasa	bhoti	taya	athaye	viyo	pa *na	

G a	kíti	vasanto	parisáya	anantara	pativedarasam			
G b	kati	vasanto	parisáyam	ánantaram	pativedetayam			
D	kítí	vásantam	palipaya	anantaliyam	pativadeta	va		
K	*	* * ma	parivayesha	antariyena	pativedetasa			

G a	me	—	savatá	save	kálo	—	evam	mayá
G b	me	—	savatá	save	kálo	—	evam	mayá
D	me	ti	savata	savam	kálam	—	evam	ma
K	me	—	¹ savata	ti a *	* tra	janasa	karomi	—

G a	añapitam	násti	hi	mo	to	ren	ustínamihi	atha
G b	añapitam	násti	hi	me	to	so	ustánamihi	atha
D	anusatha	nathá	*	*	*	*	sana	*hapi
K	atrayutaka	*	*	vika	añapi	cha	aha]	dapaka va śravaka

G a	santíranáya	va	katavya	matehi	mo	sama	
G b	santíranáya	va	katavya	matehi	me	sava	
D	athasantílanáya	cha	kataviya	matehi	me	sava	
K	va yata	pana	mahamata	na	achayoti	*	
G a	loka hitam	¹⁰ tasa	cha	puna	esa	múlo ^o	ustánam cha
G b	loka hitam	tase	cha	puna	esa	múle	ustánam cha
D	loka hito	tasa	cha	panai	yam	mule	suthána *
K	aropita	bhoti	taya	athaya	vividesa	vanijati	ra pati-
G a	atha santíraná	cha	nasti	kammata ^á taram	¹¹ sava	loka	
G b	atha santíraná	cha	násti	hi	kammata ^á taram	sava	* loka
D	* santílaná	cha	nathi	hi	kammatalam	sava	loka
K	shaye	anantariya	na	patividetaro	me	savatra	savam
G a	hitastáya	cha	kinchi	parákamámi	aham	kinti	
G b	hitattáya	cha	kinchi	parákamámi	aham	kinti	
D	hitáya	*	chati	*	palakamáva	hakam	kíti
K	kalam	evam	añapitam	maya	* * * *	sti	hi me ta
G a	bhútánam	ananúam	gachheyam	¹² idha	cha	náni	
G b	bhútánam	ananúam	gachheyam	idha	cha	náni	
D	bhútánam	a *	nyam	ye	hati	hida	cha káni
K	taña	athasantíranaya	pi	katava	mana	* trahi	me sava
G a	sukhápayámi	paratá	cha	swagam	arádhayantú	ti	etáya
G b	sukhápayámi	paratá	cha	swagam	arádhayantu	ta	etáya
D	sukhayámi	palatá	cha	swaga	basádhayantu	ti	etáye
K	loka	hitam	tasa	cha	mulam	etra	atanam atha san
G a	atháya	¹³ ayam	dhammalipí	likhápitá	kinti	chiram	
G b	atháya	ayam	dhammalipí	lekhápitá	kinti	chiram	
D	a * *	*yam	dhammalipi	likhitá	chila	—	
K	tirasa	cha	na *	hi	kamata ^á ra	¹⁴ sava	loka hita ti * ya
G a	tisteya	iti	tathá	cha	me	putá	potá cha papotá
G b	tisteya	iti	tathá	cha	me	putá	potá cha papotá
D	thiti	*	lotu	tatha	cha	—	potá — papotá
K	cha	kichi	parakamama	kiti	*	tañam	anani desa va cha
G a	—	—	cha	¹⁵ anavataram	savaloka	hitáya	
G b	—	—	cha	anuvata ^á ram	savaloka	hitáya	
D	me	palakama	sa*	* * *	ka	ki	hitáye
K	yam	ihachashu	sukhayami	paratam	cha	saga	aradhatu

G a dukarantthu idam añata agena parákamena
 G b dukarantu idam añata agena parákamena
 D dukale cha iya annata bhena palákamena
 K etaya athaye ayi dhamalipi tha sti(?)tu titika bhotu
 talha cha me putrañantaro parakramatu sa * hi * *
 thaya ma bhata ta yasa ama * añata age para-
 kamena.

THE opening is as usual with, *ahati*, for *áha*, as before, the king says; and it proceeds as at Girnar, for an unprecedentedly long time, in all seasons and in all acts there has been,—*pativedaná*, or *prativedaná*, which Mr. Prinsep proposes to render, “a system of instruction,” and understands the edict to have for its purport the establishment of a plan for the education of the people. The word, *prativedaná*, as derived from, *vid*, to know, in the active or causal form, may mean communicated knowledge certainly, but it is not commonly employed in this acceptation, and it can scarcely be so used in this place, as no Indian kings, it is to be presumed, would send instructors into the inner apartments, the *Garbhagriha*, the lying-in-chambers of his subjects’ wives, to train the shoot before it had sprung into existence. It runs more consistent with probability therefore to use the term in a less comprehensive sense, and to restrict “the communication of information” to the person of the Raja, agreeably to the alternative suggested by Mr. Prinsep, and to understand the edict as enjoining a vigilant system of *espionage*; the immediate communication to the Raja of everything that occurs.

The Kapur di Giri inscription continues for some time to run parallel with that of Girnar, with a few imperfections and some variations; as, *savam kalam*, for *save kále*, and *esimana*, for *bhunjamána*, which is a word of doubtful correctness. The sign of the singular locative is also, *si*, instead of the more regular Pali, *mhi*, as, *gabha-garasi*, for *gabhagáramhi*; we have also, *vachasi*, for *vachamhi*, the singular for the plural, but these are differences of little moment, and we may translate the whole, “These representations are (to be made) at all times, and in all acts; therefore it is enjoined by me, that at all times, whether eating, or in the palace, in the inner apartments, in discourse, in exchange of courtesy, in gardens, everywhere the persons appointed to represent affairs shall convey to me the objects of the people.” The inscription confirms the reading of Girnar, *pativedaká* or *prativedaka*, the representer, or intelligencer; intending, perhaps, by the noun of agency, an officer whose duty it was to make known, to report all matters. The repetition of, *prativedaka*,

is a less satisfactory reading than the, pativedayantu, of Dhauli, let them represent; but it may be admitted. The pativedetha of Girnar is less intelligible, although it may be intended for the second person of the plural, of the imperative, do ye represent. The three inscriptions all continue intelligibly enough, I will always attend to the objects of the people, the Kapur di Giri having, atha, for the, atham, or, athe, of the others; Sanskrit, artham or arthán: and they agree also in the passage that follows, and that which I command myself verbally, or from my mouth.

The concurrent reading of the inscriptions is then interrupted, but it is unnecessary to attempt to reconcile them, or to seek to elicit any meaning from the next five lines (in Roman characters) of the Kapur di Giri inscription beginning with, pika va, and extending to the readings, dapaka va sravaka; for the whole passage has been evidently twice inserted, either through some error of the original or the copy; and the first series of the reiteration is full of errors, as is shown by the second, which conforms with more than usual closeness to the text of the Girnar inscription, except in a few words near the close. The best mode of making this dislocation of the parallel versions intelligible, will perhaps be the repetition of the whole inscription from dapakam vá, exclusive of the part of that of Kapur di Giri inclosed within brackets, and restoring the rest of the latter inscription to its proper place in the comparative arrangement. It will be sufficient to repeat along with it only the corrected inscription of Girnar.

G b	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	đápakam	vá
K	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	dapaka	va

G b	sávápakam	vá	yavá	puna	maháthatesu	rácháyika	aro-
K	śravaka	va	yata	pana	mahamatana	achayoti	aro-

G b	pitam	bhavati	táya	atháya	vivado	ni	kati	vasanto
K	pita	bhoti	taya	athaya	vividesa	vani	jati	ra

G b	parisáyam	ánantaram	—	pativedetayam	me	savatá
K	patishayo	anantariya	na	pativedetaro	me	savatra

G b	save	kále	evam	mayá	añápitam	násti	hi	me	to
K	savam	kalam	evam	añápitam	maya	* sti	hi	me	ta

G b	so	ustánamhi	atha	santíranáya	va	katavya	matehi	—
K	taña	——	atha	santiranáya	pi	katava	mana*	trahi

G b	me	sava	loka	hitam	"tase	cha	puna	esa	múle
K	me	sava	loka	hitam	tasa	cha	————		mulam
G b	ustánam		cha	atha	santíraná	cha	násti	hi	kamma-
K	etra	atanam	—	atha	santirasa	cha	na *	hi	kama-
G b	taram	"sava	loka	hitattáya	cha	kinchi	parákamámi		
K	tara	"sava	loka	hitati*ya	cha	kichi	parakamama		
G b	aham	kinti	bhutánam	ananám	gachheyam	"idha	cha		
K	—	kiti	* tañam	anani	desa	va	cha	yam	
G b	náni	sukhápayámi	paratá	cha	swagam	arádhayantu			
K	ihachashu	sukhayami	paratam	cha	saga	aradhatu			
G b	ta	etáya	atháya	"ayam	dhammalipí	lekhápitá	kinti		
K	—	etaya	athaye	ayi	dhamalipi	tha	sti	tu	titika
G b	chiram	tisteya	iti	tathá	cha	me	putá	potá	cha
K	bhotu	————	tatha	cha	me	putrañantaro			
G b	papotá	cha	"anuvataram	sava	loka	hitáya	dukarantu		
K	parakramatu	sa *	hi *	*	thaya	ma	bhata	ta	yasa
G b	idam	añata	agena	parákamena					
K	ama	* añata	age	parakamena					

It is not easy to suggest a satisfactory interpretation of the beginning of the passage. Mr. Prinsep renders *dápakam* and *stávakam*, satire and eulogy, or what is agreeable or disagreeable; but *stavakam* was a wrong reading, and is corrected to *sávápakam*, the sense of which is doubtful; the Kapur di Giri reads *śravaka* or *śavaka*. *Dápaka* might be the Sanskrit word for fine or punishment, and the antithesis would require reward, but this is merely conjectural. *Mahathatesu* may be intended for *mahamátreshu*, and *acháyika* is probably, as Prinsep supposes, designed for *atyáyika*, although that can scarcely denote an awarder of punishment. If it were *atyayita* it might be, more or exceeding. We have here in the Kapur di Giri version, *achayoti*, but it is more correctly written in the first part *achayika*. *Aropitam bhavati*, in the repeated passage is, *aropita bhoti*, corresponding with it; and the whole may mean, whatever I declare verbally, whether it be punishment or reward, is intrusted further to the superintendents of morals.

The succeeding phrases, although tolerably concurrent, are of very doubtful import, and are evidently incorrect; but it looks as if those

dwelling near one another were invited to become informers; with this object let those dwelling, *vasanta*, in contiguous residences apprise me always and at all times; *patishaye* for *pratisraya*, a residence, is a preferable reading to *parisayam*. *Ustanamhi*, as Prinsep observes, is a doubtful word. *Atha santiránáya*, he translates, for the collection of wealth, but it may rather be intended for the distribution of wealth; *arthánám sanuttiranam*; that liberality which is to be done is designed by me, for the benefit of all mankind, for liberality is the root of virtues; *ustánam*, is a word of uncertain origin and form, and we derive no help from the *etra atanam* of *Kapur di Giri*. The next is intelligible; no deed is more conducive to the benefit of the world, which I endeavour to promote.

The parallel continues in what follows, but there are some variations of no assistance in the interpretation, which is not obvious beyond a general purpose, according to which the King says, of the various beings over whom I pass (or rule) I confer happiness on many in this world, let them afterwards seek for *Swarga*; *gachheyam*, I may go, is distinct enough, but its purport is equivocal. It and the context cannot signify, as Prinsep has it, I pass over mention of other things. Therefore for this purpose this sacred edict has been caused to be written. The concluding paragraph, on the whole, is tolerably intelligible in the *Girnar* inscription; that of the *Kapur di Giri* is possibly intended for the same, but it is probably erroneous.

The connected translation of this division agreeably to the foregoing conjectures will then run thus :—

Proposed Translation.

The beloved of the gods, King *Priyadasi*, thus declares :—"An unprecedentedly long time has past since it has been the custom at all times, and in all affairs, to submit representations. Now it is established by me that whether at meals, in my palace, in the interior apartments, in discourse, in exchange of civility, in gardens, the officers appointed to make reports shall convey to me the objects of the people. I will always attend to the objects of the people, and whatever I declare verbally,

Mr. Prinsep's Translation.

Thus spake *PIYADASI*, the heaven-beloved King!

"Never was there in any former period, a system of instruction applicable to every season, and to every action, such as that which is now established by me.

"For every season, for behaviour during meals, during repose, in domestic relations, in the nursery, in conversation, in general deportment, and on the bed of death, everywhere instructors (or *Pativedakas*) have been appointed. Accordingly do

whether punishment or reward, is further intrusted to the supervisors of morals (or eminent persons),—for that purpose let those who reside in the immediate vicinage even become informers at all times, and in all places, so it is ordained by me. The distribution of wealth which is to be made is designed by me for the benefit of all the world, for the distribution of wealth is the root of virtues. There is nothing more essential to the good of the world for which I am always labouring. Of the many beings over whom I rule I confer happiness in this world,—in the next they may obtain Swarga. With this view, this moral edict has been written; may it long endure, and may my sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons after me, continue with still greater exertion to labour for universal good.

ye (instructors) deliver instruction in what concerneth my people.

“And everywhere in what concerneth my people do I myself perform whatsoever with my mouth I enjoin (unto them); whether it be by me (esteemed) disagreeable, or whether agreeable. Moreover, for their better welfare among them, an awarder of punishment is duly installed. On this account, assembling together those who are dwelling in the reputation of much wisdom, do ye meanwhile instruct them as to the substance of what is hereby ordained by me for all circumstances, and for all seasons. This is not done by me in any desire for the collection of worldly gain, but in the real intention that the benefit of my people shall be effected; whereof moreover, this is the root, the good foundation, and the steady repose in all circumstances: there is not a more effectual mode of benefitting all mankind, than this on which I bestow my whole labour.

“But upon how many living beings (I will pass over the mention of other things) do I confer happiness here:—hereafter likewise, let them hope ardently for heaven! Amen!

“For this reason has the present religious edict been written:—May it endure for evermore; and so may my sons, and my grandsons, and my great-grandsons uphold the same for the profit of all the world, and labour therein with the most reverential exertion.”

TABLET VII.

G a	'Devánam	piya	Piyadasi	Rájá	savata	ichhati	save
G b	Devánam	piyo	Piyadasi	Rájá	savata	ichhati	save
D	Devánam	piye	Piyadasi	lájá	sachata	ichhati	* *
K	'Devanam	priyo	Priya(da)śi	Raja	savatra	ichhati	sava

G a	pásandá	vaseyu	save	te	sayaman	cha	'bháva-
G b	pásandá	vaseyu	save	te	sayaman	cha	bháva-
D	hánanda	vase	*	ti save	paga	sachhaman	bháva-
K	*pashanda	vaseyu	save	ite	sayaman		bhava-

G a	suddhin	cha	ichhati	jañasa	uchávacha	chhando	
G b	suddhin	cha	ichhati	jano tu	uchávacha	chhando	
D	sudhí	cha	ichhanti	munisá	uchávucha	chhandá	
K	śudhi	cha	ichhanti	*jano cha	uchavacha	chando	

G a	uchávacha	rágo	to	savam	va	kásanti	ekadesam	va
G b	uchávacha	rágo	te	savam	va	kásanti	ekadesam	va
D	uchávucha	lágá	te	savam	vá	————	ekadesa	* *
K	uchavacha	rago	te	savam	va	————	ekadesam	va 'pi

G a	kásanti	visuletu ^{pu}	pi	dáno	yasa	násti	sayame	
G b	kásanti	vipúle	tu	pi	dáne	yasa	násti	sayame
D	* chati	vidalí		pi	dáne	asa	nathi	dhayame
K	kashanti	vipule		pi	cha	dane	yasa	nasti sayama

G a	bhávasudhítá	va	katamñatá	va	dadhabhatítá	ra ^v	
G b	bhávasuddhitá	va	katamñatá	va	dadhabhatítá	va	
D	mávasudhi	cha	————	—	————	—	
K	bhavaśudhi	—	katañata	—	dadhabhatita	—	

G a	ni ^{ch}	va	bádham.
G b	nichá		bádham.
D	niche		baudham.
K	nicha		padham.

It is scarcely necessary to repeat the insertion of the seventh tablet, as it has been already given in a preceding number of the Journal, and the remarks made upon the purport of the greater portion of it do not seem to require revision. The original transcript, however, by Mr. Prinsep, was not placed in collateral position with

that of Mr. Westergaard, and the extent and value of his corrections could not, in consequence, be justly appreciated. I have thought it advisable, therefore, to repeat the comparative copy on the same plan as the other portions of the Inscription. I am also desirous of expressing my concurrence in the correctness of some suggestions communicated by Mr. Westergaard to Mr. Norris, affecting particularly the concluding passage, in which he reads, bhāvasuddhitá, and, drirha bhaktitá, as well as, kritajnatá, or purity of disposition and steady devotion, along with gratitude, which readings are no doubt correct. Nicha, also, as he suggests, represents, nitya, always. It is not, however, easy, even with these amendments, to give a satisfactory translation of the whole passage, as the construction beginning with, vipule pi dāne, is not clear, and the sense of sayame, and, bādham, are also questionable. It may be rendered perhaps,—where there is great liberality,—although in moral conduct there is not purity of disposition, gratitude, or steady devotion—yet it is always well.

TABLET VIII.

G a	'Atikátam	antaram	rájano	vihárayátám	^{a ásu} ñeyapu		
G b	Atikátam	antaram	rájano	vihárayátám	ñayásu		
D	* * * ta	antalam	lāja	vahalayátam	náma		
K	'Atikatam	antarane	rajamiya	viharayata	name		
G a	eta ———	magavyá	añani	cha	etárisáni	'abhíra-	
G b	eta ———	magavyá	añani	cha	etárisáni	abhíra-	
D	* khamisa *	gamaviyam	annáni	cha	edisáni	atira-	
K	nikhamisha	gamagaye	añane	cha	edisani	atasa-	
G a	makáni	^s ahumpum	so	devánum	piyo	Piyadasi	rāja
G b	makáni	ahumsu	so	devánum	piyo	Piyadasi	rāja
D	máni	puvam tinam	so	devánam	piye	Piyadasi	lāja
K	mana	abhavasu	so	devanam	priyo	Priyadaśi	raja
G a	dasavasá	bhisito	santo	^{m bo} ayáyasatam	cha	'tenesá	
G b	dasavasá	bhisito	santo	ayáyasam	? dhitena	sá	
D	desesaya	bhisito	janikha	ma sam bo pa	* * tena	tá	
K	daśavasha	bhisito	santu	nikamisaye	dhitena	ta	

G a	dhammayātā		etayam		hoti		bāmhaña		samañānam			
G b	dhamnayātā		etayam		hoti		bāmhaña		samañānām			
D	dh * * *		sa		hotiti		samannu		babhanānam			
K	dhamayatra		etaya iye		hoti		śramañam		bramañauam			
G a	dasāñe	cha	dāne	cha	thairānam	dasāñe	cha	‘hirañña				
G b	dasāñe	cha	dāne	cha	thairānam	dasāñe	cha	hirañña				
D	dasana	cha	dave	cha	vadhānam	dasano	cha	hilañña				
K	dasāne	cha	dava	—	anu * * *	* *	hirañña					
G a	patividdhāno		cha		janapadasa		cha		janasa		das ^{sa} panam	
G b	patividdhāno		cha		jānapadasa		cha		janasa		dasanam	
D	peḍḍhaviṇṇa				jānapadasa		—		janasa		datane cha	
K	patividdhane		cha		paja nasa		—		janasa		ḍaṇsāna —	
G a	dhammānusasti		cha		dhamma		pari		puva ^{chh}		cha	
G b	dhammānusasti		cha		dhamma		pari		pucchā		cha	
D	dhamonupa		* *		* * *		* *		* chha		cha	
K	dhammanusati		—		dhamma		pari		prutachhu		—	
G a	tadōpayā		esā		bhāyarati		bhavati		devānam		piyasa	
G b	tadōpayā		esa		bhāyarati		bhavati		devānam		piyasa	
D	tādāpayā		*sa		abhilame		potā		devānam		piyasa	
K	tadōpayam		eto		bhayerati		bhoti		devanam		priyasa	
G a	Piyadasino		rañño		bhāge		añño					
G b	Piyadasino		rañño		bhāge		aññe					
D	Piyadasine		lajjine		bhage		* na					
K	Priyadaśisa		rañño		bhage		aññe					

THE reading of the Kapur di Giri inscription agrees with that of Girnar, with a few exceptions, which may possibly be owing, in part at least, to imperfect transcription.

In the first passage, we have some characters interposed between, *raja*, and, *viharayata*, the form of which is doubtful, and may be merely the plural ending of the noun, followed by the pronoun, *ye*. Instead of the, *ñeyapu*, corrected *neyasu*, of Girnar, a word of doubtful interpretation, and which cannot have the sense Prinsep conjectures for it, or gaming, we have what appears to be the reading of Dhauli, *nāme*, verily. The following term also concurs with the Dhauli inscription, as, *ni-khamisha*. We have also in place of the, *magavye*, of Girnar,—a word not improbably rendered by, *nrigayā*, hunting, a modification of the Dhauli word, *gama viyam*—or as Prinsep reads

it, magaviyam, and in, gamagaye, magaye, would be satisfactory, but then, ga, must be attached to the preceding term, as nikhamishaga—a very unintelligible word. The first portion might represent, nikshamá, nikshamishaye, a derivative form of nikshamá, sin, impatience, intolerance, but the latter cannot be well accounted for, and we may suggest for it, nishkrameshu, in goings abroad. Atasamana is probably erroneous, and the word that follows, abhavasu, should be either, abhavum, or, abhavinsu,—if intended for the third person plural of the preterite. Prinsep read it, ahum pumso,—but in Mr. Westergaard's copy it is, ahumsu, which, if as it seems to be, is meant for the verb, is a word unknown. In the uncertainty that attaches to several of the expressions we may admit something like Mr. Prinsep's translation, although with considerable reserve. "In time past, princes, verily have been eagerly addicted to amusement and the chase: and other similar diversions have been (indulged in), but now Priyadasi having attained the tenth year of his reign adopts a different course." The passage that immediately follows the name of the king is read by Mr. Prinsep, ayáya satam,—which he renders "for the happiness of the wise," but the reading is, ayáyasam, not, satam,—the following words are doubtful except the last. In place of ayáyasam, we have in the Kapur di Giri table, nikamisaye, the first member of which may imply, exempt from passion or desire, as nishkáma, and the latter be intended for, swayam, self,—but which, as a whole, is not very intelligible. The words that follow have some affinity to those of Girnar, but neither inscription perhaps is quite correct. There is evident want of syntactic connection in the sentence as it stands, which is literally,—“Priyadasi being in his tenth year, (?) by him awakened this moral course,”—there is no verb to make up the sentence; dhitenata, the apparent reading of Kapur di Giri, for, dhitenasá of Westergaard's Girnar inscription does not afford any light; but a valuable correction is obtained from Captain Jacob, who makes the doubtful letter of Westergaard clearly, bo, or bau, and which with the following makes, bodhitena, awakened or instructed.

The remainder of the inscription is in close accordance with that of Girnar, with a few defects. The general sense is clear enough. Dharmayátá,—moral course or festival should be constructed apparently with what follows it—or that moral course (pursued) by him consists in this:—In seeing Brahmanas, Sramanas, and in giving them gifts, in seeing elders and in distributing gold, and in the government of the people; in the latter clause we have in the Kapur di Giri tablet, dānsana, in place of, dasana, not, daspanam, as at first read at

Girnar. As the use of the seventh case ends here, and dhammanusasti, is in the first, we may take it as the beginning of a new sentence, and render it, the institution of moral laws and reciprocal investigation of moral duties; dhamma paripuchchá, for, dharma pariprichhá, not, paripuva, as read in Prinsep's copy of the Girnar inscription, which is corrected by Westergaard, and is confirmed by the, cha, of Dhavli, and the evidently incorrect reading of Kapur di Giri, pariprutachhu, for, paripuchha cha. These are the means of effecting that (moral course) and these are in another portion (life) the removal of fear from King Piyadasi, the beloved of the gods; both inscriptions read, bhaya-rati, not, abhaya rati, which Prinsep renders enjoyment without alloy; rati, does mean pleasure, but it may also imply, cessation, and if the first member of the compound be, bhaya, fear, some such signification seems necessary.

Proposed Translation.

In past times Kings were addicted to travelling about, to companions, to going abroad, to hunting and similar amusements, but Piyadasi, the beloved of the gods, having been ten years inaugurated, by him easily awakened, that moral festival is adopted, (which consists) in seeing and bestowing gifts on Brahmanas and Sramanas, in seeing and giving gold to elders, and overseeing the country and the people; the institution of moral laws and the investigation of morals; such are the devices for the removal of apprehension, and such are the different pursuits of the favourite of the gods, King Piyadasi.

Mr. Prinsep's Translation.

"In ancient times, festivals for the amusement of sovereigns consisted of gambling, hunting the deer (or antelope), and other exhilarating pleasures of the same nature. But the heaven-beloved King PIYADASI, having attained the tenth year of his anointment, for the happiness of the wise hath a festival of religion (been substituted):—and this same consists in visits to brahmanas and sramanas, and in alms-giving, and in visits to the reverend and aged; and the liberal distribution of gold, the contemplation of the Universe and its inhabitants, obeying the precepts of religion, and settling religion before all other things are the expedients (he employs for amusement) and these will become an enjoyment without alloy to the heaven-beloved King PIYADASI in another existence."

TABLET IX.

G a	Devánam	piyo	Piyadasi	rájá	evam	áha	^{sti} atta	jano
G b	Devánam	piyo	Piyadasi	rájá	eva	áha	asti	jano
D	Devánam	piye	Piyadasi	lāja	hevam	kaha	* *	* ne
K	Devanam	priyo	Priyadaśi	rāya	evam	ahati		jano
G a	uchávacham	mangalam	karote	ábádhasa	vá	aváha		
G b	uchávacham	mangalam	karote	ábádhesu	vá	aváha		
D	*chávacham	mangalam	kaletáti	a *dha	*	*	*	
K	uchavacha	magalam	karoti	abadhasa	va	ativaha		
G a	ⁱ víváhesu	vá	putalábhesu	vá	^{mmhi} pavásamhi	vá	etamhi	
G b	víváhesu	vá	putalábhesu	vá	pavásammmhi	vá	etamhi	
D	* * *	* * *	dá	ya	pavásasi	—	etaye	
K	paja	—	patu di	—	pavasa	—	ataya	
G a	^{ana} cha	añāmhi	—	cha	jano	uchávacham	man-	
G b	cha	añāmhi	—	cha	jano	uchávacham	man-	
D	—	aunaye	va	hedisaye	* ne	bahukam	man-	
K	—	añaye	va	hadisi	* * *	na	datu	— man-
G a	galam	karote	eta	tu	mahádáyo	bahuka ^m	cha	
G b	galam	karote	eta	tu	mahádáyo	bahukam	cha	
D	galam	ka * *	* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *	*	
K	galam	karoti	ata	tu	striyaka	bahu	—	cha
G a	^m bahuvidha	cha	^{chh} yadam	va	^{nira} charadatham	cha	mangalam	
G b	bavuvīdham	cha	chhadam	va	niratham	cha	mangalam	
D	īthībinam	cha	*	su	* ni	ayam	cha	mangalam
K	bahuvidhi	cha	putika	cha	nivastiyam	cha	mangala	
G a	karote	ta	["] katavyameva	ta	mangalam	apaphalam	tukho	
G b	karote	ta	katavyameva	tu	mangalam	apaphalam	tukho	
D	kaleti	so	kativiye	lēdhena	* antale	apapale	chakha	
K	karoti	so	katavo	a	mangala	apaphalam	tukho	
G a	^r etadisam	mangalam	^{ntu} áyata	maháphale	—	—	—	
G b	etarisam	mangalam	ayan tu	maháphale	—	—	—	
D	esahadise	manga	* * *	* * *	phale	e	*malati	
K	etadi	mata kho	—	mahaphalam	ye	ma		

G a	mangalo	ya	dhamma	mangale	tata	dāsa	bha-
G b	mangale	ya	dhamma	mangale	tateta	dāsa	bha-
D	lata	tesa* *		da *	sisam	muham	ka-
K	mangala	¹⁰ ti	asa	ima	—	dasa	bha-
G a	takamhi	sampatipatī		^j gurūnam	apachiti	sādhu	pañesu
G b	takamhi	sampatipatī		gujunam	apachiti	sādhu	pañesu
D	leti	* * * *		alanam	* * *	* *	
K	takasu	samapatipatī	va	garanam	apachiti	—	pasadha
G a	sayame	sādhu	bamhaña	samañānam	sadhu	dānam	etc ^a
G b	sayame	sādhu	bamhaña	samañānam	sādhu	dānam	eta
D	* *	* *	samana	bābhanānam	—	dano	esa
K	sayama	—	samana	bramananam	—	dana	esa
G a	cha	año	cha	^ā etarisam	dhamma	mangalam	nāma a
G b	cha	año	cha	etārisam	dhamma	mangalam	nāma ta
D	—	ane	cha	* * *	* *	mangavala	* * *
K	—	aña	cha	—	dhamasa	* * *	* * *
G a	vatavyam	pitā	va	*putena	va	bhātā	vā swāmikena
G b	vatavyam	pitā	va	putena	vā	bhātā	vā swāmikena
D	* * *	pitina	*	* na	pi	bhatina	pi suvamika
K	* sava	pitana	sava	putena	sa	bhata	* * * *
G a	^ā va	sadhu	idam	katavyam	mangalam	āva	tasa
G b	vā	idam	sadhu	idam	katavya	mangalam	āva tasa
D	* * *	* *	* *	* *	* *	ava	tasa
K	* kana	pi	mata	sasta	tena	ava	prativatiye na
G a	athasa	nisthānāya	asti	cha	["] pāvataṃ	sādhu	dānam iti na
G b	athasa	nisthānaya	asti	cha	pāvutaṃ	sādhu	dāna iti na
D	athasa	nīlhatiya	a *	ha *	namvato	dane	sadhati
K	imasa	tra	tatha	* *	* saka	vasti	mangalam
G a	tu	etādisam	asti	dānam	va	anugaho	va yādisam
G b	tu	etarisam	asti	dāna	va	anagāho	va yārisam
D	se	nathi	* *	* nam	vū	* *	* * *
K	yo	tu	sa	etu	jacha	taviya	dita tadika ^a ima
G a	dhammadānam	va	dhammānugaho	vā	ta	tukho	mitena
G b	dhammadānam	va	dhammanugaho	va	ta	tukho	mitena
D	dhammadāne	—	dhammanugaho	*	* *	* *	* *
K	kusiye	eva	laki	mangalam	sāsayo	kitam	siyato

G a	va	suhadayena	—	ñatikena	va	sapáyena	va
G b	va	suhadayena	va	*ñatikena	va	suhayena	va
D	*	*	*	*	chinena	—	sapáyena tivi
K	tatha	data	kayati	sayapanena	iha	lobha	cha ava
G a	^v ochaditavya	^{hi} tamá	tamhi	^a pakaráne	idam	kacham	idam
G b	ováditavyam	tamhi	tamhi	pakarane	idam	kacha	idam
D	yovadita	*		paka	*	nasi	i * * * *
K	dhamadanasa	*	*	*	*	*	ya dhama
G a	sádhu	iti	ⁱ imáni	saka	*	*	swagam áradhentu iti
G b	sadhu	iti	imini	saka	*	*	swagam árádhetu iti
D	*	*	*	*	*	*	dhayita ve
K	ananam	atham	na	divati	ita	*	a prataranam
G a	kácha	*	*	^{ima} miná	^{ram} katavyata	yathá	ⁱ swagárádhi
G b	kácha	*	*	iminá	katavyataram	yatha	swagárádhi
D	*	*	*	*	*	*	tahe alabhi
K	va	pañapasa	va	*	hara	pakhanam	thani divatoti
	varo	abhi	asalaham	bhoti	orochase	asti	pabhata
	dhata	pañapasa	ka	pha	dina	ta	mangala.

THE inscriptions begin alike, and the general import is the same, the contrast between rejoicings on temporal occasions, and the joys which should be identical with good deeds. The term, mangala, not meaning as Prinsep has rendered it, happiness, but auspiciousness, and the demonstrations which express the feelings excited by any prosperous event—the beloved of the gods, Priyadasi observes,—every man is celebrating a variety of rejoicings. Prinsep reads, attajano, which he interprets, every man for himself; a sense it could not admit if it were the representative of átma jano,—but the corrected reading is, asti jano. At Kapur di Giri, we have simply, jano,—which is the best of all,—“he celebrates them on occasions of recovery from sickness (of escape from calamity),” or, a-bádhesu,—from, bádha, injury of any kind,—not as Prinsep renders it, ábad-dhasí, in bonds of affection. What, aváha, signifies, is doubtful, it may be intended for, áváha, inviting, or as it is combined with, viváha, marriage, it may perhaps mean betrothing; or at the birth of children, or on setting forth on journies, on this and other like occasions, a man holds many festivals. The Kapur di Giri inscription is here imperfect, and apparently, as is usual, agrees best with the Dhauli inscription,—being to the same purport as the Girnar, although using

other forms,—as, *paja*, or, *praja*, for, *puta*, and with less correctness, *ataya*, *anaya vá*, for, *etamhi*, *anamhi*.

The next sentence presents a variety in the Kapur di Giri inscription, which reads apparently, *striyaka*, or, *sriyaka*, in place of the, *mahádáyo*, of Girnar;—neither word can bear the sense which Prinsep gives it, of great ruination; as, *mahádáya*, rather signifies, a person of great charity or benevolence, and this seems most congruous with the sense of the other term, as,—“but thi benevolent man, he also makes many and various kinds of pure and disinterested rejoicings—and that is what is to be done.” The Sanskrit equivalent of, *chhadam*, in the Girnar inscription is doubtful; the Kapur di Giri has, *putika*, which can scarcely be correct. *Nir-atham*, may be for, *nirartham*,—without any interested object; the equivalent word at Kapur di Giri, may be read *nirastiyam*, although the, *r*, is doubtful, and it probably should be, *niratham*. The, *chara-datham*, of Prinsep was incorrect.

The inscription then apparently contrasts the two sorts of *mangala*,—the temporal, and the moral or religious. That or such (the temporal) rejoicing is without fruit, and is mere chaff,—but, the festival that bears abundant fruit is the festival of duty (*Dharma-mangala*), such as the reverence of the servant to the master—respect for holy teachers; *áyatam*, of long continuance, according to Prinsep, is corrected to, *ayan tu*, but this: another correction occurs in Mr. Westergaard's reading here, of, *gujunam*, for, *gurunam*,—but in that case the original must be inaccurate, as the term is without meaning, and the Kapur di Giri inscription confirms Mr. Prinsep's first reading, having also, *garanam*, or, *gurunam*, of *gurus*, or spiritual teachers. We have then the general conformity continued, although the term, *sádhu*, does not seem to be repeated, nor to be used as a substantive. *Sadhu panesu*, *sayame sadhu*, must mean purity in respect to living beings, purity in self-restraint. The Kapur di Giri tablet reads apparently *pasá (u) dha (?) sayama*, restraint with respect to animals, —connecting it with what follows, or donations to *Sramanas* and *Brahmanas*. These and other (like) acts constitute the festival of duty, and such a festival is to be cherished as a father by a son, or a dependant by a master. *Bhátá*, here can scarcely signify a brother, as it is obviously connected with, *swámika*, a master, and is more probably intended for, *bhríta*, one who is supported, a dependant.

The Girnar inscription proceeds,—this is good, this is the festival to be observed,—and continues, with a few exceptions, to be sufficiently intelligible. It differs, however, so widely from the Kapur di Giri, that a collateral interpretation of their meaning is no longer

possible. In rendering the Girnar inscription into English, I should be disposed to vary from Mr. Prinsep in some respects, although the general purport of the recommendation of moral and benevolent acts, in place of temporal festivity, is the burthen of both our translations. The purport of the first word, áva, is unknown, it may be a particle for, atha, so:—for the establishment (nisthánaya), of this object virtuous donation is practised,—pavuttam, or, pravrittam, not, právitam, concealed, secret. “There is no such charity or benevolence, as that which is moral (righteous) almsgiving or moral (righteous) benevolence. That is chaff, and is to be reprehended, either with a friend, a companion, a kinsman, or an associate:” Suhadayena, is no doubt intended for, Suhridayena, although it be synonymous with, mitra. The corrected copy of the Girnar inscription reads, ováditavya, —apaváditavya, to be shunned or blamed, not ochaditavya,—rendered by Prinsep, utaditavya, to be observed. He takes no notice of, tukho, either now or on its former occurrence, which is intended apparently for, tusha, chaff, straw, or empty, vain;—nor has he attended sufficiently to the purport of the pronoun, tá, for, tad, that, referring to that above described temporal sort of, mangalam, or rejoicing. In this manner, this is to be done, this is good,—with these means let a man seek, Swarga,—this is to be done, this is to be performed when Swarga has been obtained, aradhi; or better as at Dhauli, alábhi.

A translation of the corresponding portion of the Kapur di Giri inscription is wholly impracticable—many of the letters are very questionable, and many of the words unmeaning, and the original may have been blunderingly sculptured, or the transcript may be defective, even beyond the deficiencies acknowledged to occur here. That something like the sense of the Girnar inscription is intended may be conjectured from the recurrence of the word, mangalam. We may also conjecturally render two or three detached passages as, kitam siyato, kritam syát, let it be done: ila lobha ava dhama dánasa, here (in this world) the desire of any other than righteous gift, Ya dhamma ananam atham na divati, that law which does not seek the good of others.

Proposed Translation.

The beloved of the gods Pi-yadasi Raja, thus says: every man that is, celebrates various occasions of festivity; as on the removal of incumbrances, on invitations, on marriages, on the birth of a son,

Mr. Prinsep's Translation.

Thus spake King PIYADASI, beloved of the gods!

“Each individual seeketh his own happiness in a diversity of ways: in the bonds of affection, —in marriage, or otherwise,—in

or on setting forth on a journey; on these and other occasions a man makes various rejoicings. The benevolent man, also, celebrates many and various kinds of pure and disinterested festivities, and such rejoicing is to be practised. Such festivities are fruitless and vain, but the festivity, that bears great fruit, is the festival of duty, such as the respect of the servant to his master; reverence for holy teachers is good, tenderness for living creatures is good, liberality to Brahmans and Sramanas is good. These and other such acts constitute verily the festival of duty, and it is to be cherished as

father by a son, a dependant by his master. This is good, this is the festival to be observed, for the establishment of this object virtuous donations are made, for there is no such donation or benevolence as the gift of duty, or the benevolence of duty, that (benevolence) is chaff, (which is contracted) with a friend, a companion, a kinsman, or an associate, and is to be reprehended. In such and such manner this is to be done; this is good; with these means let a man seek Swarga, this is to be done, by these means it is to be done, as by them Swarga has been gained.

the rearing of offspring,—in foreign travel :—in these and other similar objects, doth man provide happiness of every degree. But there is great ruination, excessive of all kinds when (a man) maketh worldly objects his happiness. On the contrary, this is what is to be done,—(for most certainly that species of happiness is a fruitless happiness.)—to obtain the happiness which yieldeth plentiful fruit, even the happiness of virtue; that is to say :—kindness to dependents, reverence to spiritual teachers are proper; humanity to animals is proper: all these acts and others of the same kind, are to be rightly denominated the happiness of virtue!

“By father, and by son, and by brother; by master, (and by servant) it is proper that these things should be entitled happiness. And further for the more complete attainment of this object, secret charity is most suitable :—yea, there is no alms, and no loving kindness comparable with the alms of religion, and the loving kindness of religion, which ought verily to be upheld alike by the friend, by the good-hearted; by kinsman and neighbour, in the entire fulfilment of pleasing duties.

“This is what is to be done: this is what is good. With those things let each man propitiate heaven. And how much ought (not) to be done in order to the propitiation of heaven?”

TABLET X.

G a	'Devānam	piyo	Piyadasi	rājā	yaso	va	kiti	vā	na
G b	Devanam	piyo	Piyadasi	rājā	yaso	va	kiti	va	na
D	* * *	piyo	Piyadasi	lā *	yaso	vā	vidhī	va	na
K	"Devanam	priyo	Priyadaśi	raya	yaso	va	kiti	va	na

G a	mañáthá	va	hi	mañato	añata	—	tadáptano	dogháya
G b	mañáthá	va	há	mañato	añatá	—	tádáttano	digháya
D	* * *	bo	na	* * *	si	yaso	va	kadhavá ichhati ta dwayo
K	mañatha	va	ha	mañati	añatra	yo	pi	yaso ariti va

G a	cha	mo	janá	^{ansansá} dhammachatusá	^{su} púsunsatá	*
G b	cha	mo	janá	dhammasusunsá	sususa	tam *
D	annati	ja	* no	* * * * *	su	punasu * a *
K	imati	tena	tasa	ayatiya	cha	tada dhamasa

G a	_____	^a dhammavatán	^{cha} va	anuvīdhi-
G b	_____	dhammavatam	cha	anuvīdhi-
D	_____	dhamma * *	va	* * *
K	sāshasa	sāshrusa	amiti	dhamavatam cha anuvīdha-

G a	yatām	eta	kāyo	^o devānampiya	Piyadasi	rājā	yaso
G b	yatām	eta	kāya	devānampiyo	Piyadasi	rāja	yaso
D	* * *	eta	kāyo	* * *	iyō	* * *	* * *
K	yatam	eta	kāyo	devanampriyo	Priyadaśi	raya	yaso

G a	va	kiti	va	ichhati	ya	tu	kinchi	parākamāte	devā-
G b	va	kiti	va	ichhati	ya	tu	kichī	parākamato	devā-
D	* * *	* * *	* * *	davi	* *			palākamatī	devā-
K	—	kiti	va	ichhati	yo	tu	kichī	parakramati	devā-

G a	nam	(piyo)	Piyadasi	rāja	ta	savam	pāratikāya
G b	nam	(piya)	Piyadasi	rāja	ta	savam	paratikāya
D	nam	piyo	Piya * *	* *	* * *	* * *	* * *
K	nam	priyo	Priyadaśi	raya	tasa	vam	paratikaye

G a	kinti	sakalo	apaparāsavo	asa	esa	tu	ⁱ parāsaveya
G b	kinti	sakale	apaparīsavo	asa	esa	tu	parīsaveya
D	kintisakama	apapalāsavo	apa	kiti			pamasa * *
K	vasati	sakalo	aparīsavo	suyati	eshe	tu	parāsaveyam

G a	apuniām	‘dukaranta	kho	etam	chhā	vadhakona	va	janena
G b	apuniām	dukarantā	‘kho	etām	chhadakena	va	janena	
D	* * *	* * *	a kajo		va	* * *	* * *	
K	apuniām	dukaratu	kho	eshe	va	dakena	—	tagena
G a	usatona	va	añata	agena	parākamena	savam	parā	i
G b	usatena	cha	añata	agena	parākamena	savam	pari	
D	* * *		ta	age *	* * na	savam	—	
K	osadhiña		tava	*gena	parakamena	savam	paviti	ji
G a	cha	jiptā	eta	takho	————	————	usatena	
G b	cha	jipta	eta	takho	————	————	usatena	
D	cha	palili	* * *	* khu	dakena	lāpasatena	va	usatena
K	—	—	eta	cha	osa	* * *	* * *	* *
G a	—	dukaram.						
G b	—	dukaram.						
D	cha	dakalata.						
K	* * *	* * *						

THE inscriptions open alike with the name and title of the Prince, with this difference, that here and in the subsequent repetitions of the word, Rāya, is used for, Raja, a provincialism which is not usual at Girnar, the subsequent words also correspond, mahāthā va ha (bi,) māñate, for which we may admit Mr. Prinsep's translation, although it would appear as if no distinction were made between the nominative and objective cases.

The following in the Girnar tablet, is, as Mr. Prinsep observes, unintelligible without correction, but the corrections made by his Pandit cannot be allowed.

Mr. Westergaard's version suggests a correction more palpable, and authorises us perhaps to read the text, tad attano dighaya, that has been my own (fame) for a long time, as well as of my people. The Kapur di Giri inscription is totally different, and also apparently requires correction, at least the change of, imati, to, ichhati, a change borne out by the reading of the Dhauli inscription, which is else of little service. We may render the Kapur di Giri inscription, "but on the other hand, he who desires wealth by fame,—by him observance of duty, &c., is to be followed,"—ayatiya, is a doubtful word, but in the rest, the words agree with the Girnar tablet as corrected by Westergaard, and may be rendered,—“Let the service of the

moral law, and the service of the righteous be followed; this is to be done."

We have then the like double repetition of the prince's name in both, the beloved of the gods, wishes fame and renown, and inasmuch as he excels, the beloved of the gods, &c., it is of him for future happiness. In the following we have, *vasati*, he or it dwells instead of, *kinti*, which may be intended for, *kin-tu*, but. The sense of the following is not very clear. Mr. Prinsep renders, *aparasave*, immortality, but Westergaard's reading is, *apaparisave*, and that of Kapur di Giri, apparently, *aparisave*. It seems more likely also, that the words are in the nominative case than in the fourth, and as Prinsep supposes it may be intended for, *parisrava*,—which may be interpreted, fame, reputation. The sense of the passage will then be,—all this (worldly fame,) is worthless reputation, which is the reputation of the unrighteous, a source of pain and empty; uniting, *kho*, with the, *ta*, or *tu*, that precedes, and which is also referred to, *dukaran*. The following again is a series of perplexities; as Prinsep observes and the Kapur di Giri inscription does not help us. The terms would seem rather to refer, however, to the sources of worldly fame, and imply that by whatever means acquired it was profitless and painful as compared with the credit derived from the observance of, *dhama*. Mr. Prinsep reads the two first words, *etam vadakena*, and, *vajanena*, but Westergaard has, *etam chhadakena*, and of the second, it is questionable if it should not be divided, *va janena*,—by people, associating it with the word that follows, *usatena*,—the meaning of which, however, is doubtful. In the Kapur di Giri inscription, we have for it apparently, *osadhina*, for perhaps, *avasadhuna*—impure or vulgar people, opposed to, *dakshina*, clever or distinguished, or if we take *chhadakena* for *chhakakena*, we may render it by crafty, and the *usatena*, may be intended for, *asatyena*, untrue, or, *asatena*, unrighteous: implying, but by whatever effort it is acquired it is empty, and a source of pain. *Parācha*, *jīatā*, is in Westergaard's copy, *paricha jīta*, or *jitta*,—at Kapur di Giri, *paviti ji eta*,—in either case it is not easy to propose a satisfactory equivalent. The concluding word, *dukaram*, both in this place and where it formerly occurs, instead of representing, *dukha-karam*, cause of pain, may perhaps be preferably rendered, *dushkaram*, difficult of attainment; which would give a different purport to the latter part of the interpretation, and would not be incompatible with the words preceding it, *apunnam* for *apunyānam*, difficult for the unrighteous; and *asatyena dushkaram*, difficult to be acquired by untruth; but the general sense would be as uncertain as before, and in

proposing any translation of this tablet, a comparison, rather than a solution of difficulties is intended.

Proposed Translation.

The beloved of the gods, the Prince Piyadasi, does not esteem glory and fame as of great value, and besides for a long time it has been my fame and that of my people, that the observance of moral duty and the service of the virtuous should be practised, for this is to be done. This is the fame that the beloved of the gods desires, and inasmuch as the beloved of the gods excels, (he holds) all such reputation as no real reputation, but such as may be that of the unrighteous, pain and chaff; for it may be acquired by crafty and unworthy persons, and by whatever further effort it is acquired, it is worthless and a source of pain.

Mr. Prinsep's Translation.

"The heaven-beloved King PIYADASI doth not deem that glory and reputation (are) the things of chief importance; on the contrary (only for the prevention of sin) and for enforcing conformity among a people praiseworthy for following the four rules of virtue, and pious, doth the heaven-beloved King PIYADASI desire glory and reputation in this world, and whatsoever the heaven-beloved King PIYADASI chiefly displayeth heroism in obtaining, that is all (connected with) the other world.

"For in everything connected with his immortality, there is as regards mortal things in general discredit? Let this be discriminated with encouragement or with abandonment, with honour, or with the most respectful force, and every difficulty connected with futurity shall with equal reverence be vanquished."

TABLET XI.

G a	Devánam	piyo	Piyadasi	rāja	evam	áha	násti	etári-
G b	Devánam	piyo	Piyadasi	rāja	evam	áha	násti	etári-
K	Devanam	priyo	Priyadasi	raya	evam	abati	násti	edi-
G a	sam	dánam	yárisam	dhammadánam	dhammasanstavo	vá		^a
G b	sam	danám	yárisam	dhammadánam	dhammasanstavo	vá		
K	sam	danam	yadisam	dhammadanam	dhammasanstavo	—		

G a	dharmasamvibhago	vá	dharmasambandho	vá ^a	tata	idam
G b	dharmasamvibhāgo	va	dharmasambandho	va	tata	idam
K	dharmasamvibhago	—	dharmasambandha	va	* ta	idam
G a	bhavati	dāsabhatakamhi	samapatipatī	mátari	pitari	
G b	bhavati	dāsabhatakamhi	samapatipatī	mátari	pitari	
K	—	danam bhatakranam	samapatipatī	mata	pitushu	
G a	sádho	sususá	mitasasuta ^{mitapastata}	—	ñatakānam ⁱ	bámalhá
G b	sádhu	sususá	mitasastata	—	ñatikānam	balmana
K		suśrusa	mi * tasa	stata	ñatakānam	—
G a	samañānam	sádhu	dānam	pāñanam	anārambho	sádhu
G b	samanā	sádhu	dānam	pāñanam	anārambho	sádhu
K	samanabamanasa *	* danam	pranamam	anarambho	—	
G a	etam	vatavyam	pitá	va	putena	va bhátá — va
G b	eta	vatavyam	pitá	va	putena	va bhátá — va
K	etam	vatavo	pitrena	pi	putrena	pi va bhatena pi va
G a	—	mitasa	sutena	bhatikena ^{nat}	va	vyava patí-
G b	—	mitasasa	sta	bhatikena	va	ava pati-
K	mitrena	pi	mitrasa	sta	tuna	— ava pati-
G a	vesiyehi	idam	sádhu	idam	katavyam	so tathá ^á karui
G b	vesiyehi	idam	sádhu	idam	katavyam	so tathá katai
K	vesiyena	—	sadhu	ida	katavo	so tatha karatam
G a	—	lokavasa ^{ch}	árádha ^á	hoti	parato ^a	vá anantam puñam
G b	—	lokavasa	aradho	hoti	parata	cha anantam puñam
K	ihā	loka	cha aradheti	—	parata	cha anantam puñam
G a	—	bhavati	tena	dharmadānena.		
G b	—	bhavati	tena	dharmadānena.		
K	krasava	bha * ti	tena	dharmadanena.		

THE portion of the Girnar inscription contained in the eleventh table which is not found at Dhauli, occurs at Kapur di Giri with a singularly exact conformity to the inscription at Girnar. The sense of this, as Mr. Prinsep observes, is clear: it might be doubted if his interpretation of, dharmā-dāna, the giving or teaching of virtue, be correct, as the ordinary meaning is merely a gift of any kind from a pious or virtuous motive: the context, however, seems to warrant his

explanation. There are no uncertainties of reading until we come to the, *mitasa suta*, of Prinsep, corrected to *mitasa stata*, which is rather unintelligible. *Suta* is most probably wrong, for when the words recur shortly afterwards, *suta*, has been preceded by *putra*, a son, and there can be no need of both. The Kapur di Giri inscription has, *mitrasa tata*, which would be satisfactory, *tata*, meaning, *tatah*, then, also, and; but in the second place we have, *mitra sastatuna*, which is equally puzzling, particularly as we have, *mitra*, before, showing that, *mitrasasta*, is something else; if we could read the whole, *mitrasat-tuna*, it might mean, to friend and foe; but this is scarcely allowable. The Kapur di Giri inscription is more consistent than that of Girnār in its use of the instrumental case in this part for all the terms. *Pativesiyena* in place of *pativesiyehi* is only the singular for the plural. Mr. Prinsep renders, *Bhatakena*, by *Bhritakena*, a labourer, but the corrected reading is, *bhatikena*, which will rather be *bhar-trikena*, by a master.

In the following passage, the Kapur di Giri tablet, however, reads, *iha*, preceding it by, *karatam*, which can scarcely be correct: it also inserts a very unintelligible term, *krasava*, which must be a mistake. Prinsep reads, *karu-i-loka*, but Westergaard has, *kata*, with which the *i*, may perhaps be preferably attached; *kata-i*, for, *kritwa*, having done *i*, for, *iha*, or, *idam*, is unusual, and it is not wanted.

Proposed Translation.

Thus says the beloved of the gods King Priyadasi: there is no gift like the gift of virtue, whether it be the praise of virtue, the apportionment of virtue, or relationship of virtue. This (gift) is the cherishing of slaves and dependents, pious devotion to mother and father, generous gifts to friends and kinsmen, Brahmanas and Sramanas: and the non-injury of living beings is good. In this manner, it is to be lived by father and son, and brother, and friend, and friend's friend (?), and by a master (of slaves), and by neighbours. This is good, this is to be

Mr. Prinsep's Translation.

Thus spake PRIYADASI, the king beloved of the gods!—

“There is no such charity as the charity which springeth from virtue,—(which is) the intimate knowledge of virtue, the inheritance of virtue, the close union with virtue! And in these maxims it is manifested:—“kindness towards servants and hirelings; towards mother and father, dutiful service is proper: towards a friend's offspring, to kindred in general, to Brahmanas and Sramanas, almsgiving is proper: avoiding the destruction of animal life is proper.”

practised, and thus having acted, there is happiness in worldly existence, and hereafter great holiness is obtained by this gift of virtue.

"And this (saying) should be equally repeated by father and son, (?) by the hireling, and even so by neighbours in general!

"This is excellent—and this is what ought to be done!

"And whoso doeth thus is blessed of the inhabitants of this world: and in the next world endless moral merit resulteth from such religious charity."

TABLET XII.

G a 'Devānam piyo Piyadasi rājā sava pāsandāni cha pava-
G b Devānam piyo Piyadasi rājā sava pāsandāni cha pava-

G a jītāni cha gharistāni cha pūjayati dānena cha vividhāya
G b jītāni cha gharistāni cha pūjayati dānena cha vividhāya

G a cha pūjāya pūjayati nā^{no}na tu tathā dānam va pūjā^o
G b cha pūjāya pūjayati nena tu tathā dānam va puje

G a va devānam piyo manñato yathā kiti sāra vādhī asa
G b va devānam piyo manñato yathā kiti sāra vādhī asa

G a sava pāsandānam sāro vādhīta bahuvīdhā["] tādā^a gasa^t
G b sava pāsandānam sāra vādhīta bahuvīdhā tasa tasa

G a tu idam mūla^m ya va ehagutīⁱ kinti āptapāsandā
G b tu idam mūlam ya va vigutī kinti āttapāsandā

G a pūjā parāpāsanda garahā va hō^{no} bhavo apakarañamhi
G b pūjā parāpāsanda garahā va no bhavo apakarañamhi

G a lahakā va asa t^atama tamhi pakaraṇe pūjeta yā tu
G b lahakā va asa tamhi tamhi pakaraṇe pūjeta yā tu

G a ova parāpāsandā tena tena pakaraṇena evam katam
G b ova parāpāsandā tena tena pakaraṇena evam katam

G a āptapāsandā cha vādhayati parāpāsandasa cha["] apakaroti
G b āttapāsandā cha vādhayati parāpāsandasa cha upakaroti

G a *tadanīathā karoti āptapāsāṇḍam cha chhabhati parāpā-
 G b tadantethā karoti āttapāsāṇḍam cha chhauoti parāpā-

G a saṇḍasa cha hi apakaroti yo hi kāchi āptapāsāṇḍan
 G b saṇḍasa va pi apakaroti yo hi kāchi āttapāsāṇḍa

G a pūjayati parapāsāṇḍam va garahati *sava āptapāsāṇḍa
 G b pūjayati parapāsāṇḍam va garahati sava āttapāsāṇḍa

G a bhatiyā kinti āptapāsāṇḍam dīpaye ma iti yo cha
 G b bhatiyā kinti āptapāsāṇḍam dīpaye ma iti so cha

G a puna tatha karoti āptapāsāṇḍam bāḍhātaram^h papapunāti
 G b puna tatha karoti āttapāsāṇḍam bāḍhātaram upahanāti

G a tasa^{ma} cho^{yo} vāno^{dha} eva["] sādha["] *kinti maññamanñasa dham-
 G b tasa ma vāyo eva sādha kinti maññamanñasa dham-

G a mam suṇāta cha^s pusanserava^{cha} evam hi devānam
 G b mam suṇāja cha susunseracha evam hi devānam

G a piyasa ichhā kīti^v saya pāsāṇḍā bahu^{su} pūtā cha asu
 G b piyasa ichhā kinti sava pāsāṇḍa bahu sutā cha asu

G a kalāṇāgamā cha asu *yo cha tata tata^{saṇṇato} papunhata hi
 G b kalāṇāgama cha asu yo cha tatā tata pasannāto hi

G a vatavyam devānam piyo^{no} tathā dānam va pūja
 G b vatavya devānam piyo no tathā dānam va pūja

G a va maññato yathā kinti^{ḥā} sārī vāḍhī asa sava pāsān-
 G b va maññato yathā kinti sāra vāḍhī asa sava pāsān-

G a ḍānam bahukāⁿ cha etāya["] *athāya vyapatā dhamma
 G b ḍānam bahakā va etāya athā vyāpatā dhamma

G a mahāmātā chaⁿ ithaijha kho mahāmātā cha^{cha} vava ka-
 G b mahāmātā cha itthijha kha mahāmātā cha vacha bhā-

G a mikā cha añe cha nikāyā ayan cha etasa phalāya
 G b mikā cha añā cha nikāyo ayan cha etasa phalaya

G a āptapāsāṇḍa vadhī cha hoti dhammasa cha dīpanā
 G b āttapāsāṇḍa vadhī cha hoti dhammasa cha dīpanā

I do not find in the Kapur di Giri inscription anything that corresponds with the twelfth division of the inscription at Girnar, and it will be recollected that it is also wanting at Cuttack. Mr. Prinsep has proposed to account for the omission at the latter place, by supposing that it might not have been thought necessary, for as the Buddhist religion prevailed already in Kalinga, it was not requisite to enjoin its propagation or enforce the conversion of heretics in that province. It may be reasonably doubted, however, if the inscription has reference to conversion of any kind, and whether the term, *Páshanda*, as it is used in these tables, admits of the ordinary translation of unbeliever. Such a sense is clearly incompatible with the opening passage which declares that King Piyadasi honours or worships, (*pujayati*) all *páshandas*, he worships them with gifts, and with worship (or honours) of various kinds. There can be no doubt of the rendering, the words are distinct, and their sense is clear enough, and we cannot conceive of a pious king making a public announcement that heresies are the objects of his especial reverence and bounty. *Páshanda*, must therefore, have some other sense, and the remainder of the edict, indicates its meaning to be any form of religious faith, any profession of belief.

There runs throughout the inscription, as Mr. Prinsep remarks, a frequent repetition of the terms, *ápta pásaṇḍa*, and, *para pásaṇḍa*, as the mutual antitheses of each other. The first he renders converted heretic, from, *ápta*, aptus, gained, the latter, unconverted; understanding by, *para*, extreme, ultra,—but, *para*, properly signifies other, or further, and cannot admit of such a latitude of interpretation: it has probably here its own usual sense of, other, different, and suggests a correction, not only in the meaning, but the reading of, *ápta*, which should be, not *ápta*, but, *átta*, for, *átman*, own. Mr. Prinsep quoting a passage cited by Mr. Turnour, in which, *sankhitto*, for, *sankshipta*, occurs, observes that, *pt*, is never, in the Girnar text, contracted to, *tt*, but is written at length, as in, *chaptára*, *ápta*, but this would be so utterly at variance with the practice of Pali writing, that the fact may be questioned: the form of the compound character, it is true, resembles that of, *pt*, more than that of, *tt*, but we cannot always depend upon the seeming forms of conjunct letters, and a character which is dubious, only perhaps from our imperfect acquaintance with the alphabet, is not of sufficient weight to countervail a fundamental rule of the Pali dialect,—the substitution of a double, *t*, for, *t* and any other consonant. I read therefore not, *apto*, or, *chaptaro*, but, *atto*, *chattáro*, and in the former case, with the advantage of providing for a natural contrast to, *para*, *átta pásaṇḍa*, one's own faith, *para pásaṇḍa*, the faith of

others. The object of the edict is then made obvious, and whilst it gives the preference to those who follow the faith of the king, it directs that reverence shall be shown to all systems by which moral obligations are instilled.

There is another objection to Mr. Prinsep's rendering of the term *Pāsanda*, which he translates, unbelievers; the term, when it first occurs is in the neuter plural, *Pāsandāni*, and it cannot therefore be applied to person; it must denote, the thing, not the individual; the belief, not the believer: the same may be said of the following terms, *pavajitani* and *gharastāni*, which are also separated from the term, *pāsandāni*, by *cha*, and cannot therefore be rendered as the epithets, ascetic or domestic; they must be rather, the condition of mendicant and householder. Mr. Prinsep remarks, that the accusative, i, plural, has been written with *āni*, instead of *ān*; but as far as we know of Pali grammar, this can only be true in the neuter gender. *Pavajitāni* is intended for *pravrajitani*, from *pravrajita*, a wandering mendicant, more probably than as Mr. Prinsep supposes *Pravijitani*, those by whom their passions are subdued.

Mr. Prinsep's reading subjoins the letter, *na*, to *pūjāyati*; when the word recurs in Mr. Westergaard's copy it appears to be, *no*, but in either case its meaning is doubtful, unless it be conjoined with the following syllable, and read, *nena* for *anena*, by him. *Kiti*, which Mr. Prinsep supposes to be for, *kīrtti*, glory, appears afterwards as *kiṇti*, which cannot be so identified, and it is not a very probable rendering in the first instance, for it does not appear what connexion can exist between *Piyadasi's* patronage of the *Pasandas*, and his own true glory, or as Prinsep translates, "not that the beloved of the gods deemeth offering or prayers to be of the same (value) with true glory." The following passage also can scarcely be borne out by the text. *Sāra vridhhi*, cannot denote, even paraphrastically, salvation. Instead of Prinsep's rendering I should prefer, subject however to considerable doubt, something to the following effect. The beloved of the gods, *Piyadasi* the king honours all religions, whether ascetic or domestic. He honours them with gifts and with worship of various kinds; but the beloved of the gods does not esteem gifts or honours so much as the increase of that which is essential: *vridhhi*, the increase; *sāra*, the essence (of religion); meaning probably the discharge of moral obligations. The edict then proceeds: By (of) him the encouragement of the essentials of all religion is in various ways, but this is the root of it. We have the same doubtful words, *ya va chaguti* or *chiguti*, or according to Westergaard, *ya va viguti*; either is questionable, but apparently not indispensable to the sense, as that may be

connected with what precedes, the root of the encouragement being this; that honor be given to his own faith, and that that of others be not reviled, nor treated with injuries, *apakaranamhi*: the word that follows, read by Prinsep, *lahaka*, is considered by him to be identical with *lápaka*, a speaker, a disputant; and he accordingly translates the passage as if it related to controversial discussion, which is more than doubtful. Again his reading of *tamhi-tamhi*, as one word, from *tama*, darkness, cannot be correct, as it is nothing more than the repetition of the pronoun; *tasmin tasmin*, agreeing with *pakaranamhi*, *prakaranamhi*, in this, and this manner; that is, "Let the reverence be shown in such and such a manner as is suited to the difference of belief, as when it is done in that manner it augments our own faith and benefits that of others."

The edict then proceeds: Whoever acts otherwise, *tadanthethá*, possibly for *tadanyatha* *karoti* injures his own religion and annoys that of others; *chhanoti*, Prinsep conjectures to be intended for *kshanoti*, what hurts or destroys, which is possibly correct. The text continues, without offering any great difficulty to give the following reading:—"who reverences his own faith and reviles that of another, saying, let all become of one faith, or let us spread the light of our faith, he only throws obstruction in the way of his own belief." There does not seem to be any reason for rendering, *bhaticyá*, by pecuniary consideration, for *bhritiyá* by hire, although it is not easy to propose any preferable interpretation. The following passage is also very perplexing, and although Prinsep's version, "such an act in his very breath and well being," cannot be the translation of *tasa maváyo eva sádhá*, it is not easy to guess what it implies. In the following, again, there is probably something wrong; Prinsep has it, "more-over hear ye the religion of the faithful and attend thereto;" understanding, apparently, *sunája* for *sruyatám*, "let it be heard," a change not possible. *Mána manása*, he renders also *manyamánasya*, obedient, faithful, but if the initial letter could be got rid of, it were more probably, *anya anyasya*, of one another; while *sunája*, which is connected with *susunsera*, by the conjunction *cha*, must be a noun in the third case, possibly the instrumental of *sunati*, *sunatyá*, reverence, respect. Altogether I should be disposed to render the passage something like this, "of such a person the more beneficial course is by the discharge of mutual respect and service."

I am at a loss to understand upon what principle the next passage is rendered by Mr. Prinsep, "apparently such is the desire, the act, the hope of the beloved of the gods, that all unbelievers may speedily be purified and brought into contentment speedily." The beginning is

of course correct, "such is the wish of the beloved of the gods," but the rest cannot admit of the above version; he seems to have been led to it by supposing, *asu*, to be identical with, *ásu*, quickly; but even if the identification were correct, it would not justify the rendering, while it seems probable that it is not a particle but a verb, implying there are, or have been, as Prinsep has also suggested for *santi* or *santu*, from, *As*, to be, making, *ásu*, in the third person plural of the imperfect. There are also some remarkable words in this paragraph, which it is extraordinary that Mr. Prinsep should have overlooked, as they are those which are common to the religious books of the Brahmans and Buddhists, although applicable in an especial manner to the scriptural authorities of the latter, *Suta* and *agama*, meaning by the first, *Sutras*, fundamental rules, and by the second, any religious authorities. In the inscription it is said, that many *Pasandas*, have such authorities, and the passage indicates therefore, *Piyadasī's*, especial encouragement of those religions which depend upon written authorities, of the people of the book. The sentence, as I understand it, imports "in all religions there may be many scriptures, (*Sutras*) and many holy texts, (*Kalyanágama*) and such are to be maintained for their purity; or *pasannáte*, (mé,) through (my) favour. We then have a repetition of the sentence which occurred earlier in the tablet, the order a little changed; "the beloved of the gods does not esteem gifts or reverence so much as encouragement of the essentials;" it is then added, and for this purpose various officers are appointed to exercise an inspection over all *Pásundas*: these are, *Dharma mahamātras*, regulators of morals. The next term is indistinct, Prinsep reads it, *Ithaijha*, which he derives from, *Ithairyya*, and renders it, "possessing fortitude of mind;" but as far as it is legible it is, *itthi*, for *strī*, a woman, and is connected with, *Mahamata*, as *Ithiya mahamatā*, denoting a different officer, perhaps one charged with the superintendence of the weaker sex.

The following is *vacha*, (for *vatsa*?) *blumika*, "seats of tenderness," which Prinsep reads *vividha kāmikas*, "practisers of every virtue," but being separated by *cha*, from what precedes, the words must signify some other functionaries; so also we have next, *ano cha nikāya*, and other officers, not congregations. The edict concludes: The advantage of this (measure) is the increase of our own faith and the lustre of moral duty. Prinsep makes these but one; for the increase of converts is the lustre of religion; but the employment of the conjunction, *cha*, repeated, clearly distinguishes them, although the use of one verb shows that the *vṛiddhi*, of the *átta pásanda*, and the enhancement of *Dharma*, is alike the object of the edict.

If this part of the edict has been rightly interpreted by the present proposed rendering, it is one of the most remarkable of the whole. It shows entire latitudinarianism in the author, not indifference perhaps to forms of religion, but strict impartiality, and a decided preference of moral over ritual; for the *Sāraviddhi*, the increase of that which is spiritual, over either the, *ātta*, or *para-pasanda*, individual or different form of faith. What is considered to be essential, is clearly enough laid down in other edicts; reverence of gods, Brahmins, ascetics, elders, duty to parents, affection to children and friends, and general benevolence and humanity.

Proposed Translation.

The beloved of the gods King Priyadasi, honours all forms of religious faith, whether professed by ascetics or householders; he honours them with gifts and with manifold kinds of reverence; but the beloved of the gods considers no gift or honour so much as the increase of the substance (of religion): his encouragement of the increase of the substance of all religious belief is manifold. But the root of his (encouragement) is this: reverence for one's own faith, and no reviling nor injury of that of others. Let the reverence be shown in such and such a manner as is suited to the difference of belief; as when it is done in that manner it augments our own faith and benefits that of others. Who ever acts otherwise injures his own religion and wrongs that of others, for he who in some way honours his own religion and reviles that of others, saying, having extended to all our own belief, let us make it famous, he who does this throws

Mr. Prinsep's Translation.

"The heaven-beloved King PRIYADASI propitiateth all unbelievers, both of the ascetic and of the domestic classes; by charitable offerings, and by every species of puja doth he (strive to) propitiate them. Not that the beloved of the gods deemeth offerings or prayers to be of the same (value) with true glory. The promotion of his own salvation promoted in many ways, the salvation of all unbelievers of which indeed this is the root, and the whole substance.

"Again, the propitiation of the converted heretic, and the reproof of the unconverted heretic must not be (effected) by harsh treatment: but let those who enter into discussion (conciliate them) by restraint of their own passions, and by their mild address. By such and such conciliatory demeanour shall even the unconverted heretics be propitiated. And such conduct increaseth the number of converted heretics,

difficulties in the way of his own religion: this, his conduct, cannot be right. The duty of a person consists in respect and service of others. Such is the wish of the beloved of the gods; for in all forms of religion there may be many scriptures (Sutras) and many holy texts which are to be thereafter followed through my protection. The beloved of the gods considers no gift or reverence to be equal to the increase of the essence of religion; and as this is the object of all religions, with a view to its dissemination, superintendents of moral duty as well as over women, and officers of compassion as well as other officers (are appointed), and the fruit of this (regulation) will be the augmentation of our own faith, and the lustre of moral duty.

while it disposeth of the unconverted heretic, and effecteth a revolution of opinion in him. And (he) encourageth the converted heretic, while he disposeth completely of the unconverted heretic, whosoever propitiateth the converted heretic, or reproveth the unconverted heretic, by the pecuniary support of the converted heretic. And whoso, again, doth so, he purifieth in the most effectual manner the heretic; and of himself such an act is his very breath, and his well-being.

"Moreover 'hear ye the religion of the faithful and attend thereto:' even such is the desire, the act, the hope of the beloved of the gods, that all unbelievers may speedily be purified, and brought into contentment speedily.

"Furthermore from place to place this most gracious sentiment should be repeated: 'The beloved of the gods doth not esteem either charitable offering or puja, as comparable with true glory. The increase of blessing to himself is as much (importance) to all unbelievers.'

"For this purpose have been spread abroad ministers of religion possessing fortitude of mind, and practices of every virtue: may the various congregations co-operate (with them) for the accomplishment therefore. For the increase of converts is indeed the lustre of religion."

TABLET XIII.

K	'Tari? cha * * *	pañasa * * *	śita	ati a * * *	ya *
G a	(') * * *	* tasa	pasamatá	tatihatám	bahu
G b	* * *	patasa	pasamátam	etáhatam	baha

K	* * *	* * *	* * *	ga sapata	śi apa-
---	-------	-------	-------	-----------	---------

G a	tívatá	kammata	tatá	pachhá	adháná ^ú	ladhesu	kalin-
G b	távata	kammata	tatá	pachhá	adhúná	ladhesu	kalin-

K	tati	tisati ?	* * *	* *	* *	* *	* *
---	------	----------	-------	-----	-----	-----	-----

G a	gesu tí	—	dhammaviyo	* * *	vadhho	va	marañam
G b	gesu ti	ve	dhammaváyo	* * *	vadhho	va	marauam

K	* *	*tutivi	na	janasha	dhamā	cha	ye	taram	radhi
---	-----	---------	----	---------	-------	-----	----	-------	-------

G a	va	apaváho	va	janasata	—	—	—	—	—
-----	----	---------	----	----------	---	---	---	---	---

G b	va	apaváho	va	janasata	—	—	—	—	—
-----	----	---------	----	----------	---	---	---	---	---

K	lipa	badhasa	vadanasha	hata	dhanasarída	cha	ghusha
---	------	---------	-----------	------	-------------	-----	--------

G a	—	bádhe	vedana	mata	—	cha	—
-----	---	-------	--------	------	---	-----	---

G b	—	bádham	vedana	mata	—	cha	—
-----	---	--------	--------	------	---	-----	---

K	mata	ganamata	—	devanam	piyasa	inam ?	cha	ma * *
---	------	----------	---	---------	--------	--------	-----	--------

G a	—	ganamata	cha	devá	—	* * *	—	—
-----	---	----------	-----	------	---	-------	---	---

G b	—	ganamata	cha	devá	—	* * *	—	—
-----	---	----------	-----	------	---	-------	---	---

K	sa	mata	hata	tara	na ?	me	satata	ha * * 'vasati
---	----	------	------	------	------	----	--------	----------------

G a	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

G b	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

K	bamanaka	śulakha	yaña	tapasha	cha	atavim	vayevati
---	----------	---------	------	---------	-----	--------	----------

G a	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

G b	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

K	hata	jasha	etam	bhoti	sususha	mata	pitri	shusuśa
---	------	-------	------	-------	---------	------	-------	---------

G a	—	—	—	—	pá	mátá	pitari	sususá
-----	---	---	---	---	----	------	--------	--------

G b	—	—	—	—	sa	mátá	pitari	susunsá
-----	---	---	---	---	----	------	--------	---------

K	shusuri	tana	sususha	mitaristata	so	anya	*ñatiki	shu-
---	---------	------	---------	-------------	----	------	---------	------

G a	guru	—	sususá	mitas ^{an} astata	sapiya	hā	ñátike	pa-
-----	------	---	--------	----------------------------	--------	----	--------	-----

G b	guru	—	susunsá	mitasanstata	saháya	ñátike	sa-	—
-----	------	---	---------	--------------	--------	--------	-----	---

K dasa bhatikanam saga patipati su ? phaliti savatra bhati

G a dása * * * * * ' * * * * *

G b dása * * * * * * * * * *

K apagara va vadhi va abhoti tanaga jasu mapayasha

G a _____

G b _____

K api suti likhanam tasa atipa eva thara shamarisa

G a _____

G b _____

K sutasa aya ñati vavansana 'prapunati tatantam pitisha

G a — ya ñatiká vyanam papunáti tata so pitesu^a

G b — ya ñatiká vyanam papuhoti vata so pi tesa

K va upaghato pati anti bagavo sutrasa dama??? gavama

G a — upagháto patipatí bhage vesíya pa^{áva} * * * * *

G b — upagháto patipati bhago vásá sava * * * * *

K cha devanam priyasa nasti iva bhavata prinam anja

G a * * * * * * yato násti manusánam ekataramhi —

G b * * * * * * yato násti manusánam ekataramhi —

K chha dana ga pasu oseiyama tu sananda? kusti gaha

G a — pásandamhi — na náma pásáde yávatako^{jana} * *

G b — pásandamhi — na náma pásáde yávatako jana

K vimoha cha chhatu para? * * * 'śata bhagava sa-

G a tado — * * * * * na yasake — va mi-

G b tada — * * * * * na yasaka — va mi-

K hasra bhagam va asagatra devata devanam piyasa ye

G a taveyá vapi ataviyo _____

G b taveyá vapi ataviyo _____

K pachhae patiriyati mamitratiyati va devanam piyasa

G a _____

G b _____

K yaśasa mama?? ya pitri eva ri devanam piyasa avati

G a _____ devánam pi* * yata^{sa}

G b _____ devánam pi* * pasa

K bhavati pi enadati ana * japiti atava pipitrena

G a ——— pi jite pati
pajito pita * * * * *

G b ——— pi jite pati * * * * *

K bhava 'devanam priyasa vachatiti sakiti eva khapayana

G a —————

G b —————

K ??? yasa ichhati hi devanam priye sava bhutanam ?chhati

G a ——— ' * * * * * * * sava bhutánam achhatá

G b ——— * * * * * * * sava bhutánam achhátim

K — sayama sama itiya va bhasiya ayotiya tasa niti

G a cha sayaman cha sama * * * * *

G b cha sayaman cha samam * * * * *

K viya devanam piyasa yo dhamavijayo se cha ??? di

G a — cháron cha madava cha * * * * *

G b — cherán cha mádava cha * * * * *

K devanam piyasa ???????? tisha 'saupapi yo janaśa ?

G a —————

G b —————

K sanyatam Antiyoko nama yona raja parancha tena

G a * * * * * * * * yona rája parancha tena

G b * * * * * * * * yona rája parancha tena

K Antiyokena chaturō |||| rajano Turamara nama An-

G a ——— chaptáro ——— rájáno Turamáyo cha An-

G b ——— chattáro ——— rájáno Turamáyo cha An-

K tikona nama Mako nama Alikasunari nama likhichha

G a ^{igono} takana cha ^o Magá cha * * * * *

G b takana cha Magá cha * * * * *

K thana jayavata anansa ye asa miti puna rajanti eva hi

G a * * * * *

G b * * * * *

K yona kati yasha ti . bha? 'roja miti hi kite andhapaña

G a ————— idha^o parindesu

G b ————— idhe parindesu

K jasha savatam devanam priyasa dhamanuśastim anu-
 G a — savata devānam piyasa dhammānusastim anu-
 G b — savata devānam piyasa dhammānusastim anu-

K vestariyatam pi devanam priyasa na va ichhayantiti
 G a vatareyata pādāti —————
 G b vatareyata pidūti —————

K piśatama devanam piyasa dhama? vatamvi dhana??

G a

G b

K śama?? vidhiyati asti dhiya śavi iyescu atilatu

G a ————— ¹⁰ * * * * * * * *

G b ————— * * * * * * * *

K bhena bhoti savata vijayesu ? ¹⁰ vijaye sati rase

G a * * * * vijayo savathā puna vijayo pīti raso

G b * * * * vijayo savathā puna vijayo pīti raso

K viladha bhosa priti — dhamaśiya hi ? ekatari sa

G a sá ladhá sá pīti hoti dhammavijayamhi —————

G b sá ladhá sá pīti hoti dhammavijayamhi —————

K mo viparanti va mo rama atilamesu devanam piyo

G a

G b

K etaye???? ayo dhame ? pi??? kiti prataga prito me

G a ————— " * * * * * * * *

G b ————— * * * * * * * *

K tasa eva vijayo ya ma vijatavam ama cha samñako

G a * * * * vijayam ma vijetavyam main ñasarasakē

G b * * * * vijayam má vijetavyam mam ñasarasake

K yo si yajati ???????? chaturo hi ya vijama cha

G a eva vijayechhāti ————— cha * * —————

G b eva vijayechhāti ————— cha * * —————

K "yo dhama vijasa va hi navam kiki param sasti

G a

G b

K kosi ra iti vati ko tu yaceha mata pasadhi ila

G a ¹² * * * * * * * * * * * * * * i

G b * * * * * * * * * * * * * * i

K lokika — paralokika —

G a lokiká cha páralokiká cha [* * * va sweto hasti sava

G b lokiká cha páralokihá cha [* * * va sweto hasti savá

G a loka sukhaharo náma]

G b loka sukhaparo náma]

TABLE XIII.

THE division of the Girnar inscriptions, numbered by Mr. Prinsep as 13, finds a counter part at Kapur di Giri; but unfortunately it is not of a nature to supply the defects and imperfections of the Girnar tablet. As mentioned by Mr. Prinsep, the rock at Girnar is at this part so much mutilated, that it is difficult to put together the context of the entire tablet: portions of the inscription are wanting at either end of each line, especially at the beginning, but the middle portions are tolerably perfect. The rock at Kapur di Giri has not apparently suffered much mutilation, and the inscription is consequently more complete, supplying the words effaced from that at Girnar; but it is not only in this respect that it exceeds in length the Girnar inscription. There are evidently additional passages which the latter does not contain, and which intervene between what are apparently intended for the same passages in both places; on the other hand, there are several obliterations or deficiencies in the Kapur di Giri inscription where that at Girnar is entire. In collating the two, therefore, wide gaps occur without a parallel, partly owing to these respective mutilations,—partly to the additional matter at Kapur di Giri. From place to place, however, concurrent passages do occur, which leave no doubt of the general identity of the inscriptions, as will appear from the collateral copy.

It happens, however, still unfortunately, that neither the additional nor those which are evidently identical passages in the Kapur di Giri inscription, are for the major part to be satisfactorily deciphered. The circumstances under which the characters were transcribed sufficiently account for the disappointment. Mr. Masson has explained the impossibility of taking a fac-simile of this part of the inscription, and he was obliged, after many fruitless efforts to effect his purpose, to be content with carrying off a copy only. But the position of the stone, which prevented a fac-simile from being made, was also obviously

unfavourable to the making of a faithful copy, and it is not at all therefore to be wondered at, that the forms of the letters should have assumed deceptive appearances, differing consequently in different parts of the inscription, in words which there is reason to believe to be the same, and varying from one another in words which from one or two distinct characters are known to be identical, as for instance in, *Devanam priya*, in which the latter term is generally legible, and we may therefore infer that, *devanam*, precedes it; but without such a guide it would be impossible to read, *devanam*, as it presents itself in a number of different and unusual forms. Mr. Masson's copy, however, is more legible than one made by a native employed by M. Court the use of which has been kindly allowed to the Society by Professor Lassen. In this, very few words can be made out even by conjecture, and with the assistance of Mr. Masson's transcript. It has not, however, been wholly unserviceable.

Mr. Prinsep has ventured to propose a continuous translation of the Thirteenth Tablet, although he admits that insulated phrases alone are intelligible. Such is the case in the Kapur di Giri inscription; and it were very unsafe to propose anything like a connected rendering even of what is perfect, although a few words and phrases are decipherable, and may be compared with similar words and phrases in the Girnar tablet. In most of these passages, however, the reading of the original itself is conjectural only, for it will follow from the sources of imperfection described, that although a transcript has been attempted as above in Roman characters, yet no great reliance is to be placed on the greater part of it, particularly where parallel passages are not found in the Girnar inscription.

One word only can be identified in the opening of the two inscriptions, *pañasa* for *patasa*, the meaning of neither of which is satisfactory. Blank or indistinct letters follow at Kapur di Giri, so that we have no similar terms with those which occur at Girnar, and which Mr. Prinsep reads, *pasumatá tatihatám*, &c., readings which are rendered doubtful by Mr. Westergaard's copy. We have nothing corresponding with, *kalingesu*, supposed by Mr. Prinsep to refer to the Kalinga provinces, &c., to which he adds, "not to be obtained by wealth;" *adhanáladesu*, for which Mr. Westergaard has, *adhúná ladhesu*, which might be rendered, now, or recently acquired. His *dhamma viyo*, which he renders, decline of religion, Mr. Westergaard reads, *dhammaváyo*; the sense of both is equally doubtful, the word, *viyo*, being of uncertain purport, as noticed by Mr. Prinsep, (vi. 586), where it occurs singly in a passage in one of the Lát inscriptions; a like compound, *viyo dhamma*, is rendered by Mr. Tur-

nour, perishable things (vi. 623), but it may possibly be intended for, vyaya, waste, expenditure. The two copies agree in reading, vadho va maranam va apaváho va, but these words can scarcely mean murder and death, and the unrestrained license of mankind, especially as the last term appears to be, janasata, a good man, not janasa, the genitive case. We have however at Kapur di Giri, janasha, though none of the preceding. The following words partly agree, but there is no making sense of them till we come to, devanam priyasa, of which at Girnar we have, deva, only. This is followed by a series of questionable syllables at Kapur di Giri, unknown to the Girnar tablet, but which apparently refer to Brahmanical rites, bamanaka sulakha, to sacrifice, yajna, ascetic penance, tapasha, and dwelling in the forests, atavim; and possibly recommends that reverence should be paid to those who observe such practices, jasha etam bhoti súsusha (for yasya etadbhutasya súsrúsá). In recommending what follows both inscriptions agree; service or duty to mother, father, friends, kindred, servants, and masters. In place of padása, Girnar *b* reads sudása, which the Kapur di Giri inscription confirms.

We have then again a passage with which there is nothing to correspond at Girnar, the purport of which, without help from such a collateral source it is not easy to conjecture; a few words may be guessed at as, yasha, fame, or, yasa, of whom; suti likhanam, which will admit of, writing of the Srutí or Veda; and sutasa, which may here be intended possibly for, sutrasya, a rule or precept. The words that follow nearly agree, ñátina vavansana prapunati; but they cannot be rendered without great uncertainty, cleave away the calamities of generation.

We have several legible words in what follow, more or less concurrent with those of Girnar; where the latter reads, bhagovesa, according to Prinsep, bhago vesiya, we have what appears to be Baghavo, which if correct, may be intended for Bhagaván, a divinity, sometimes applied to Buddha; but the Girnar readings leave this doubtful. In the passages that follow, again, we may detect a few similar words, but the Kapur di Giri inscription has much additional matter here, and, Devanam priyasa, is repeated six times for once that it occurs at Girnar. Sava blutánam, of all creatures, is common to both, but the, achhatá or achhátim, of Girnar, appears to be, ichhati, he wishes, at Kapur di Giri.

Deficiencies at the end of the seventh and beginning of line eight, at Girnar, are rather more than adequately filled up at Kapur di Giri, and some of the additional matter is important. The name and

designation, Antiyoka nama yona Raja, are given distinctly: why he is introduced does not very well appear, but we might venture to connect it with what precedes, and to interpret and fill up the passages thus: He who had obtained the alliance of men—he has been received as the friend of (me) Devanampriya: we have for this conjectural rendering, Devanam priyasa, then some unreadable letters. sampapi, (for samaprápi) yo janasa (su) sanyatam. At Girnar we have only, yona Raja, but no name, no Antiochus, nor any circumstance relating to him. Both inscriptions next read, parancha, and afterwards; the Girnar has then, tena, by him, which as no name was specified, Mr. Prinsep necessarily interpreted, by whom, (rather by him) the Greek king: in the Kapur di Giri tablet, tena, refers of course to Antiochus, but not to leave any doubt on this score, the inscription repeats the name, and gives us, tena Antiyokena, by that Antiochus; thus furnishing a very important illustration of the Girnar tablet. What then was done by him? by that Antiochus? this is not to be made out very distinctly, but connected with what follows, it may be conjectured to imply that four other Greek princes were brought under subjection by him. There can be no doubt that the numeral which Mr. Prinsep read, chaptaro, is properly, chattáro. There is no, p, in the Kapur di Giri inscription, it is clearly, chataro, with the usual disregard of correct orthography and identification of long and short vowels. In the Girnar inscription the form is like, pt, no doubt, but this combination, as already observed treating of Tablet XII., is so utterly repugnant to the most characteristic feature of Pali, that it cannot be allowed; and in this case, if the original word intended be the Sanskrit numeral chatwára, the p would be gratuitously inserted. The only admissible reading is, chattáro, the regular Pali form of the Sanskrit, chatwára: four indistinct marks follow the numeral in each inscription, being probably intended for figures equivalent to four. We then have the several names of the four princes remarkably distinct, and it luckily happens that M. Court's copy is also very legible in this passage, and entirely confirms Mr. Masson's readings. The passage runs thus: Turamara nama, Antikona nama, Mako nama, Alikasunari nama. At Girnar the last name is wanting, there being some letters obliterated. We have also some variation in the reading, but not material, the names being there, Turamáyo cha, Antakana cha, Magá cha. The two inscriptions give us no doubt the names of four Greek princes, of whom, Ptolemy, Antigonus, and Magas may be readily recognised, although, how they come into juxta-position with Antiochus on the one hand, or Alexander, on the other, is only to be explained,

by the supposition, that although these names had from their celebrity reached the west of India, the history of the persons so named was vaguely and incorrectly known.

We shall however recur to the subject: at present we are only concerned with the purport of the inscription, which is unfortunately by no means distinct. We have the order, by that Antiochus four Yavana kings, were;—what? neither inscription enables us to answer: the Girnar inscription being in fact here mutilated. Mr. Prinsep, in his introductory remarks, supplying the connexion conjecturally, fills up the blank by reading, “And the Greek king besides, by whom the four kings have been induced to permit,” but there is nothing to warrant such a translation; and in the actual rendering of the passage, (p. 261) the latter clause is omitted: we there have, “and the Greek king, besides, by whom the kings of Egypt, Ptolemaios, Antigonos, (?) and Magas, &c., and then follows a blank. The Kapur di Giri inscription, although entire, presents characters of undetermined value, and probable inaccuracies. The first term, *likhichha thana*, is very doubtful; the next appears to be, *jayavata*, which might be rendered victorious, in the instrumental case, agreeing with, *Antiyokena*; *anansa*, is doubtful, both as to reading and sense; *ye asa miti puna rajanti*, might be rendered, “they who (the kings) become his friends, again shine (or enjoy dominion).” We may also render, *eva hi yona kati yasha*, “such, indeed, is the, *Yavaná*, become, of whom;” there then follow some indistinct characters, and the phrase seems to terminate with, *miti hi kite*, “friendship or alliance has been made.” This I admit is very conjectural, and a corrected copy or a better founded interpretation of the original may show it to be wholly erroneous; but in the present state of the inscriptions we may hazard the conjecture, that the purport of the whole passage may be, that the four princes after being overthrown by Antiochus, had been reconciled to him, and that an alliance had then been formed between him and the Indian prince *Devapriya*. There is nothing whatever to justify the supposition that *Devapriya* had attempted to make converts of the Greek princes, or to disseminate the doctrines and practices of Buddhism in their dominions.

We have some apparent correspondence between the inscription in the next passages, referring to the moral laws promulgated by *Devapriya*, but they do not give the sense Mr. Prinsep attaches to those at Girnar: the correspondence is only for a few words, and a long passage ensues, to which there is nothing parallel at Girnar after allowing for a partial mutilation. We can only render the last words, “is not everywhere in victories;” a few words again agree, in

which the term, vijaya, occurs, and which, at Girnar at least, winds up with what may be rendered, although pleasure may be derived from conquest, yet the best pleasure abides in the triumph of virtue. Apparently we then have at Kapur di Giri, the name of the prince as usual, and the moral edict, aya dhama (li)pi: next come, vijaya ya ma vijatavam, victory is not to be conquered, for the vijayam má vijetavyam, of Girnar; the latter is however here mutilated and presents other omissions, so that the two cannot be compared; both end alike, ila, or, i lokika (cha) para lokika (cha), "in this world and in the next;" preceded at Kapur di Giri by, what appears to be, yaccha mata pasadhi, "which opinion is celebrated." There is nothing that corresponds with what appears to be a supplementary addition to the inscription at Girnar.

The state of this transcript of the Kapur di Giri inscription is very far from satisfactory, while from the names it records, it appears to be of great historical value. It would be very desirable to have a facsimile carefully taken, and as the part of the country in which it is situated is now within the reach of British influence, it might now be possible, perhaps, without much difficulty, to have such a copy. In the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal for February, 1848, Captain Cunningham mentions in his Diary, his having visited the spot and taken a copy of the most legible portion of the inscription; he adds, however, that a proper copy could only be made by levelling the ground and building up platforms, and by white-washing the surface of the rock to bring out the sunken letters: a work of time, but which would well repay the labour¹. The translation of Mr. Prinsep is subjoined for the sake of reference, but I cannot venture to propose any connected version.

Mr. Prinsep's Translation.

.....Whose equality, and exertion towards that object, exceeding activity, judicious conduct afterwards in the *Kalinga* provinces not to be obtained by wealth the decline of religion, murder, and death, and unrestrained license of mankind; when flourished the (precious maxims) of *Devánampiyō*, comprising the

¹ Correspondence of the Commissioners deputed to the Tibetan frontier. In the number of the Journal of the Bengal Asiatic Society for January last, a paper by Mr. Laidlay, is announced on Edicts of Asoka, found by Captain Cunningham near Shah-baz-ghari, from which we may infer that a fresh transcript has been sent to the Society.

essence of learning and of science:—dutiful service to mother and father; dutiful service to spiritual teachers: the love of friend and child; (charity) to kinsfolk, to servants (to Brahmans and Sramans, &c., which) cleanse away the calamities of generations: further also in these things unceasing perseverance is fame. There is not in either class of the heretics of men, not, so to say, a procedure marked by such grace, ... nor so glorious nor friendly, nor even so extremely liberal as *Devánampiyō's* injunction for the non-injury, and content of living creatures and the Greek King besides, by whom the Kings of Egypt, PROLEMAIOS and ANTIGONOS, (?) and MAGAS, ... both here and in foreign (countries), everywhere the religious ordinances of *Devánampiyō* effect conversion, wherever they go; conquest is of every description: but further the conquest which bringeth joy springing from pleasant emotions, becometh joy itself; the victory of virtue is happiness: the victory of happiness is not to be overcome, that which essentially possesses a pledge of happiness,—such victory is desired in things of this world and things of the next world!

And this place is named the WHITE ELEPHANT, conferring pleasure on all the world.

TABLET XIV.

K	''Aya	dhamalipi	devanam	piyaśina	————	raña
G a	Ayam	dhammalipí	devánam	piyena	Piyadasiná	ráñá
G b	Ayam	dhammalipí	devánam	piyena	Piyadasiná	ráñá
K	likhasati	eva	asati	teti	likhina	asti yo vistivida?
G a	likhápitá	asti	eva	'sankhitena	asti	majhamena asti
G b	lekhápitá	asti	eva	sankhitena	asti	majhamena asti
K	cha	savatasa	sasti	gapasama	apakivati	likhitena —
G a	vistatena	nava	savám	pavata	ghatítam	'mahálako pa-
G b	vistatena	nacha	savam	pavata	ghatítam	mahálako pi-
K	————	cha	liki	??	me ??	śame hi va
G a	vijitam	bahu	cha	likhitam	likhápayisam	cheva asti
G b	vijitam	bahu	cha	likhitam	likhápayisam	chema asti

K	agatitam	va	punapuna	apiti	tasa	tasa	yajasa	ma-
G a	cha	etakam	'punapana	vútam	tasa	tasa	athasa	má-
G b	cha	etakam	punapuna	vutam	tasa	tasa	athasa	má-
K	dhiriyayo	va	* * *	* *	¹³ pavijayati	tasa	sava	
G a	dhúritáya	katá	jano	tathá	patipajetha	¹⁴ tata	ekadá	
G b	dhúritáya	kiti	jano	tathá	patipajetha	tata	ekadá	
K	avati	hi	asamasa	li??	śávasin	khatika	va	
G a	—	—	asamátam	likhitam	asadesam	cha	sachháya	
G b	—	—	asamátam	likhitam	asadesam	cha	sachháya	
K	? ? ?	? ?	ichhati	lipikitam	eva	apandanena	—	
G a	káraúam	cha	^{alo} Relachepu ^{ptá}	lipikará		^{radhena} pandithena	cha	
G b	káraúam	va	alovettá	lipikará		paradhena	va	

TABLET XIV.

CONTINUOUS with the inscription which corresponds with No. 13 at Girnar, we have a portion that presents a like identity with that numbered 14. The commencement is clearly the same; this moral edict has been caused to be written by the beloved of the gods; with a difference of name, which is here Piyasi. An exact agreement does not seem to continue; although it is not impossible that a more correct transcript might restore the concurrence more completely. In some instances, we have obviously the same combination intended as, *tasa tasa yajasa madhiriyaye*, should no doubt be as at Girnar, *tasa tasa athasa madhuritáya*, "through the pleasantness of this meaning." There does not appear to be anything agreeing with what Mr. Prinsep conjectures to be the name of the Pundit by whom the inscription was composed; and M. Westergaard's reading instead of, *Rela chepu lipi kará pandithena cha*, is, *Aovetta lipikará paradhena cha*, while at Kapur di Giri we have merely, *lipi kitam eva apandanena*: what either implies, I cannot pretend to interpret.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.

THE inscriptions on the rocks of Girnar, Dhauli, and Kapur di Giri, and on the columns of Delhi, Allahabad, Mathia, and Bakra, form two classes of inscriptions, the general style and purport of both of which are essentially the same, while there is a close agreement

between the individual members of each class. They are documents of singular interest from their antiquity, the illustration which they afford of the written language of India at a distant era, and from the light they cast upon the state of society, and the doctrines then either prevalent or in progress. They offer also some illustration of the political history of the country, although less than we might have expected or may desire. Even with respect to the subjects to which they evidently relate, they are less satisfactory than could be wished, and except with certain qualifications and within probable limits, they leave us very uncertain as to the conclusions which may be safely drawn from them, and very much in the dark as to the objects for which they were made public, the time at which they were sculptured, and the prince by whose orders they were promulgated. On all these points many doubts and difficulties are suggested by the inscriptions themselves, as far as their interpretation may yet be relied on, the solution of which is likely to require still more careful and competent investigation.

According to the late Mr. James Prinsep, the original decipherer of all these inscriptions, the documents in question are royal edicts, the essential objects of which were the establishment and propagation of the precepts of the Buddhist religion throughout India, and through the adjacent parts of Persia and Khorasan, which were then subject to the Seleucidan princes. These edicts were issued by Asoka, the grandson of Chandragupta, who was contemporary with Antiochus the Great, and who having become a convert to Buddhism early in his reign, engaged with the zeal of a proselyte, and the munificence of a monarch, in projects for its propagation. These deductions have been worked out by Mr. Prinsep from his translations of the inscriptions with remarkable acuteness, with most meritorious carefulness and labour, and with very extensive research, and they have received the ready acquiescence of many of the most distinguished oriental scholars. In the main they may possibly be correct; but the interpretation, as we have seen, is sometimes disputable, and the meaning appears to have been imperfectly or inaccurately rendered in various instances; the language of the inscriptions, even where satisfactorily readable, is often very perplexing, owing partly to its peculiar structure, and as it must be admitted, in a still greater degree to our imperfect knowledge of it; and it is frequently of questionable decipherment in consequence of the indistinctness, the occasional deficiencies, and possible ignorance of the original inscribers. The historical facts asserted of the supposed originator of the edicts, rest upon grounds that are not of an indisputably authentic character, and that are irreconcilable

with those we derive from other sources of information; and these considerations may naturally make us hesitate before we assent to the conclusions which have hitherto been considered as established, or recognise them as no further liable to investigation.

In the first place, then, with respect to the supposed main purport of the inscription, proselytism to the Buddhist religion, it may not unreasonably be doubted if they were made public with any such design, and whether they have any connexion with Buddhism at all. In favour of the supposition, it is argued, first, that the prince who assumes the credit of being the promulgator, and who names himself, Priya, or Piyadasi, was the same with Asoka, who, according to the traditions of the Buddhists, was a zealous promoter of their faith, and issued, according to one statement, 84,000 precepts, or according to another, erected as many monuments, vihars, chaityas, and sthúpas, monasteries, temples, and topes, in its honour, and for its propagation; and secondly, that the language of the inscriptions is evidence of a similar intention. The identity of Asoka and Piyadasi, I shall subsequently advert to. The meaning of the language of the inscriptions is, to say the least, equivocal.

The language itself is a kind of Pali, offering for the greater portion of the words forms analogous to those which are modelled by the rules of the Pali grammar still in use. There are, however, many differences, some of which arise from a closer adherence to Sanskrit, others from possible local peculiarities, indicating a yet unsettled state of the language. It is observed by Mr. Prinsep, when speaking of the Lát inscriptions, "The language differs from every existing written idiom, and is as it were intermediate between the Sanskrit and the Pali." The nouns and particles in general follow the Pali structure; the verbs are more frequently nearer to the Sanskrit forms; but in neither, any more than in grammatical Pali, is there any great dissimilarity from Sanskrit. It is curious that the Kapur di Giri inscription departs less from the Sanskrit than the others, retaining some compound consonants, as *pr* in *priya* instead of *Piya*; and having the representatives of the three sibilants of the Devanagari alphabet, while the others, as in Pali, have but one sibilant: on the other hand, the Kapur di Giri inscription omits the vowels to a much greater extent, and rarely distinguishes between the long and short vowels, peculiarities perhaps not unconnected with the Semitic character of its alphabet.

The exact determination of the differences and agreements of the inscriptions with Pali on the one hand, and Sanskrit on the other, would require a laborious analysis of the whole, and would be

scarcely worth the pains, as the differences from either would, no doubt, prove to be comparatively few and unimportant, and we may be content to consider the language as Pali, not yet perfected in its grammatical structure, and deviating in no important respect from Sanskrit. Pali is the language of the writings of the Buddhists of Ava, Siam, and Ceylon; therefore it is concluded it was the language of the Buddhists of Upper India, when the inscriptions were engraved, and consequently they are of Buddhist origin. This, however, admits of question; for although the Buddhist authorities assert that Sakya Sinha and his successors taught in Pali, and that a Pali grammar was compiled in his day; yet, on the other hand they affirm, that the doctrines of Buddha were long taught orally only, and were not committed to writing for four centuries after his death, or until B.C. 153, a date, no doubt, subsequent to that of the inscriptions. In fact, the principal authorities of the Cingalese Buddhists appear to have existed in Cingalese, and to have been translated into Pali only in the fifth century after Christ.

According to M. Burnouf and Mr. Hodgson, the earliest Buddhist writings were not Pali but Sanskrit, and they were translated by the Northern Buddhists into their own languages, Mongol and Tibetan. It does not appear that they have any Pali books. The Chinese have obtained their writings from both quarters, and they probably have Pali works brought from Ava or Ceylon. They have also, according to M. Burnouf, translations of the same Sanskrit works that are known in the North. It is by no means established, therefore, that Pali was the sacred language of the Buddhists at the period of the inscriptions, and its use constitutes no conclusive proof of their Buddhist origin. It seems more likely that it was adopted as being the spoken language of that part of India where Piyadasi resided, and was selected for his edicts, that they might be intelligible to the people. Hence, also, the employment of different alphabets, that of Kapur di Giri being the alphabet current in Afghanistan and Bactria, as we know from the Græco-Bactrian coins. The use of the provincial or local alphabet was evidently designed for the convenience of those to whom it was familiar, while the ancient form of the Devanagari was that employed in Hindustan as being there in general use. The popular currency of the language, admitting that it might have been the spoken dialect of the north-west of India, would be more likely to prevent, than to recommend its use as a 'sacred' language, and its being applied to such a purpose by the Southern Buddhists was in some degree probably owing to their being as a people ignorant of it, and it would then assume in their eyes a sanc-

tity which as a spoken dialect it was not likely to possess. At the same time, we can scarcely suppose that the language of the inscriptions was understood in all the countries where they have been discovered, beyond the Indus, at Delhi, in Behar, in Orissa, and Guzerat, where we know that very different dialects, however largely borrowing from a common source, at present prevail. Neither is it likely that edicts intended to regulate the moral conduct of the people at large should have been intelligible only to Buddhist priests, or should have been perpetuated on pillars and rocks solely for their edification. We may therefore recognise it as an actually existent form of speech in some part of India, and might admit the testimony of its origin given by the Buddhists themselves, by whom it is always identified with the language of Magadha or Behar', the scene of Sakya Sinha's first teaching; but that there are several differences between it and the Mágadhi, as laid down in Prakrit grammars, and as it occurs in Jain writings. It is, as Messrs. Burnouf and Lassen remark, still nearer to Sanskrit¹, and may have prevailed more to the north than Behar, or in the upper part of the Doab, and in the Punjab, being more analogous to the Sauraseni dialect, the language of Mathura and Delhi, although not differing from the dialect of Behar to such an extent as not to be intelligible to those to whom Sakya and his successors addressed themselves. The language of the inscriptions, then, although necessarily that of their date, and probably that in which the first propagators of Buddhism expounded their doctrines, seems to have been rather the spoken language of the people in Upper India, than a form of speech peculiar to a class of religionists, or a sacred language, and its use in the edicts of Piyadasi, although not incompatible with their Buddhist origin, cannot be accepted as a conclusive proof that they originated from any peculiar form of religious belief¹.

There is nothing in the injunctions promulgated or sentiments expressed in the inscriptions in the sense in which I have suggested their interpretation, that is decidedly and exclusively characteristic of Buddhism. The main object of the first appears, it is true, to be a prohibition of destroying animal life, but it is a mistake to ascribe the doctrine to the Buddhists alone. Whatever may have been the cause, and it is not unlikely that the progress of Buddhism may have exercised some influence in popularising the notion, the Brahmans adopted

¹ Turnour's Introduction to the Mahawanso, xxii, *Sá Mágadhi mula bhása.*

² *Essai sur le Pali*, p. 187, "La Palie était presque identique à l'idiome sacré des Brahmanes, parce qu'elle en dérivait immédiatement."

³ Pali, means, original text, regularity.—Maha. *Introd.* xxii.

and enforced it equally at an early period, and declared tenderness for living creatures to be the first of duties. Ahinsá parama dharma, tenderness is the supreme merit, is the language of Manu, and the Mahábhárata repeats the same text, and adds that "it is best devotion, supreme truth, the most precious of gifts, the best friend of man, the highest happiness, the best Veda. Whatever gifts may have been offered at sacrifices or ablutions performed in sacred streams are inferior in their consequences to tenderness of animal life,—such are its virtues that they could not be enumerated in a hundred years '.

No doubt can be entertained of the purport of, Ahinsá, not only from its literal meaning, and its being described as that sentiment which looks upon living beings as upon ourselves, but from the association along with its eulogy of the merits of abstaining wholly from eating flesh, which the great and eternal Rishis, it is said, have declared to

¹ The merits of, Ahinsa, are cursorily mentioned in very many passages in the Mahabharata, but there is a panegyric in particular upon it, and the non-eating of flesh, in the Anusásana Parva.—Printed Edition, vol. iv., l. 5654 to 5722. The following are a few of the expressions.

अहिंसा परमो धर्मस्तथा ऽ हिंसा परन्तपः ।

अहिंसा परमं सत्यं यतो धर्मः प्रवर्त्तते ॥ and again

अहिंसा परमो धर्मस्तथा ऽ हिंसा परो दमः ।

अहिंसा परमं दानमहिंसा परमं तपः ॥

अहिंसा परमो यज्ञस्तहिंसा परमं बलं ।

अहिंसा परमं मित्रमहिंसा परमं सुखं ॥

अहिंसा परमं सत्यमहिंसा परमं श्रुतं ।

सर्वयज्ञेषु वा दानं सर्वतीर्थेषु चाश्रुतं ॥

सर्वदानफलञ्चापि नैतत्तुल्यमहिंसया ।

अहिंस्वस्य तपो ऽ क्षयमहिंसो यजते सदा ॥

अहिंसः सर्वभूतानाम् यथा माता यथा पिता ।

एतत् फलमहिंसाया भूयश्च कुरुपुङ्गव ।

न हि शक्या गुणा वक्तुमपि वर्षशतैरपि ॥

be the certain source of blessings—of wealth, of fame, of life, and of heaven'. The prohibition of destroying living creatures would not therefore be conclusive evidence of a Buddhist origin, even if it were more positively and distinctly enunciated ; but as already remarked, the language of the inscription is far from being satisfactorily interpreted, and the prohibition appears in strange contradiction with what appears to be, if it is rightly understood, the practice of the Royal kitchen, in which thousands of animals were slaughtered daily. So far also from the eating of flesh being utterly reprehended, a subsequent passage, as I have proposed to render it, seems to authorise an admission that the eating of animals for good purposes is not objectionable ; as remarked also by Mr. Prinsep on the inscription on the south face of the Láts, which prohibited the death of certain animals, or of some at particular days, the use of animal food is not absolutely interdicted,—on the contrary, he remarks that the goat, sheep, and pig, are expressly mentioned as kept for fattening, and are only not to be slaughtered while with young, or giving milk. Eating animal food is in fact common among the Buddhist nations of the present day, and its prohibition therefore, even if more clearly enjoined, would be no incontrovertible proof of Buddhist dictation.

Again, we cannot look upon the provisions of the second edict—even if they did include medicaments for animals and men, which is at least questionable, as containing anything exclusively Buddhist. Digging wells, planting trees, constructing resting-places for travellers, are quite as meritorious in the eyes of the Brahmanical, as in those of the Buddhistical Hindus. The same may be said of the injunctions in other edicts, to shew due reverence and affection to parents, teachers, children, and dependants. Numerous parallel passages may be found in Brahmanical writings, as essential parts of duty, or Dharma.

To these inconclusive evidences of Buddhism we have to oppose negative indications of a less equivocal character. Of this description is the total omission of any allusion to Buddha himself by any of his appellations, Sugata, Tathágata, Gautama, Sákya, or Sakyasinha, all which occur repeatedly in the Buddhist writings, both of Tibet and of Ceylon, and which the Sarnath Buddhist inscription proves it was not unusual to allude to in the sculptured inscriptions of that

¹ धनं यशस्यमायुष्यं स्वर्ग्यं स्वस्त्वयनं महत् ।

मांसस्याभक्षणम् प्राङ्गर्नियताः परमर्षयः ॥

religion. Neither is there any allusion to his family, or to any of his early disciples, or to any of the Bodhisattvas, who are sufficiently conspicuous in the *Kah-gyur* and *Mahawanso*, nor does any hint occur of *Sthūpas*, *Vihārs*, or *Chaityas*, or of the *Bodhi*, or *Bo tree*,—everywhere else so frequently adverted to. Neither do we find anything that can be regarded as peculiarly Buddhist doctrines, for the moral duties inculcated are the same that are enjoined by Brahmanical writings, and there is at least one duty enforced which it is very difficult to reconcile with the spirit of Buddhism; reverence for, or rather the service of (*Susrusha*) the Brahmins. Now one great object of *Sākyasinha's* reformation was the subversion of the authority of the Brahmins, and it were utterly inconsistent with that object to hold up their service as one of the most weighty of moral obligations. The same service, it is true, is to be paid to the *Sramanas*, who are usually understood to be Buddhist ascetics,—or at least disciples of Buddha. In the *Asoka avadāna*, *Sramanas* are called the Sons of *Sākya*—but they are reproached with sitting on carpets and broad seats, and are therefore questionable ascetics. The term, however, means ascetic in general, one who endures fatigue or privation, and there might be Brahmana *Sramanas* as well as Buddhist *Sramanas*. Buddhist ascetics are also more commonly designated *Bhikkhus*, mendicants, and Buddha himself is often termed *Maha-Bhikhu*,—a word that never occurs in the inscriptions. However, we may be content to accept *Sramana* as commonly understood,—and to regard the passage as intending both Brahmins and Buddhist ascetics, putting them upon a footing of equal sanctity. On the *Girnar* rock and the *Lāts*, the Brahmins have precedence, and the term is, *Bahmana-samana*. In *Cuttack*, and at *Kapur di Giri*, we have the order reversed, *Samana-bāhmana*. At the same time this objection is not altogether fatal to the Buddhist tenor of the inscription, as it appears that the phrase, *Sramana-brahmana*, is not unfrequent in the Buddhist *Sutras*, which are among their fundamental authorities—but although mentioned together it does not appear that they are thus associated as equally entitled to veneration. They are merely enumerated among the objects of the knowledge of Buddha, who is described as knowing all creatures, including *Sramanas* and *Brahmanas*. In so far, therefore, as the service of the Brahmins is enjoined, the injunction can scarcely be regarded as consistent with Buddhism.

It may be granted, however, that *Piyadasi* intended to enjoin equal reverence to Brahmins and to Buddhist teachers, for such a purpose would be not incompatible with that spirit of unqualified toleration which seems to have been one of his principal objects. I

have already endeavoured to shew that edict, No. 12, in particular, exhibits this intention most unequivocally, and that the prince enjoins in it no attempt at conversion, but universal respect for all forms of religious belief,—his own as well as any other *Páshanda*. The term, *Páshanda*, I may here add, although rendered heresy or heretic, does not bear properly so restricted a meaning. According to the annotators on the vocabulary of Amara Sinha in voce, it applies to external conformity with the Vedas, although neglecting their observances. The only synonyme is *Sarva-lingi*, one who wears the marks of all, that is, who assumes the staff, water-pot, girdle, and cord of the three first classes. One commentator explains, *Sarva*, by its synonyme, *Siva*, and makes the *Páshandas*, *Saivas*, but the best explanation seems that quoted from an early scholiast, *Vyári*, who says it includes the *Sámkhyas*, the *Sábdikas*, or logicians, and the *Vedántis*, or the three chief philosophical schools, the *Saivas*, the naked ascetics, or *Nagnas*, and the *Bauddhas*, all, in short, who do not regard the authority of the Vedas as infallible and divine, and who draw from them doctrines which tend to set aside the necessity of mere formal ceremonies,—and this, in fact, appears to be the main object of all the edicts, whether on the rocks or on the pillars,—the exaltation over all ceremonial practices, over a religion of rites, of the observance of moral obligations; the enjoining in preference to the sacrifice of animals, obedience to parents, affection for children, friends, and dependants, reverence for elders, *Sramans* and *Brahmans*, universal benevolence, and unreserved toleration. These are evidently the principal objects of *Raja Piyadasi's* enactments, and are no more compatible with exclusive Buddhism than with exclusive Brahmatism. They cannot be regarded as wholly peculiar to either, although it is very possible that like the same doctrines plentifully scattered through the *Sánti* and, *Anusásana Parvas* of the *Mahabharata*, they may have been suggested by the teaching of the early Buddhists, and originated in an attempt to effect a sort of compromise between the two religions before any active hostility had commenced, while the Brahmanism of the Vedas was yet in the ascendancy, although Buddhism was beginning to assail its pretensions to exclusive predominance. It is remarked by M. Burnouf, that in the early Buddhist writings, very little difference appears between the Buddhists and *Brahmans*, and *Buddha* is often described as followed by a crowd of *Brahmans* as well as *Bhikhus* and *Sramans*. The edicts may be taken as historical evidence that Buddhism was not yet fully established, and that *Piyadasi* was desirous of keeping peace between it and its predecessor by inculcating social duties and universal toleration in place of either ritual or dogma.

An argument in favour of the Buddhist character of the inscriptions has been deduced from the asserted identity of the Raja Piyadasi with Asoka, the grandson of Chandragupta, Raja of Magadhá, and with the latter's conversion to Buddhism according to Buddhist tradition, and his munificent patronage of its professors, and construction of innumerable monasteries, temples, Sthúpas, and columns in its honour. The identification rests upon a passage in the *Dípawanso*, a work of rather doubtful character, being supposed by Mr. Turnour to be properly termed *Maháwanso*;—although not the same as that which he translated. He conceives it to be older than the *Maháwanso* of Buddhaghosha, but it is not of a very remote antiquity, as it comes down to the end of the reign of Mahasena of Ceylon, A.D. 302, being a work of the fourth century. Mr. Turnour had but one copy of it, which was procured from Ava, in a very imperfect condition. As far as it can be received as authority, it no doubt is warrant for the identification,—stating that Piyadassano, (better Pali than Piyadasi) was inaugurated 218 years after the death of Buddha: at his inauguration many preternatural manifestations took place. The date here assigned to Piyadassano's inauguration is the same as that which is specified as the date of the inauguration of Asoka, and therefore leaves no doubt of the intention of the writer. Other circumstances are related in connexion with this passage, which are told of Asoka by name,—as his being the son of Bindusáro, and grandson of Chandagutto, his government of Ujjayin before he succeeded to the throne of Pátaliputra, and his begetting Mahindo, who became a great saint, and carried Buddhism into Ceylon, the main object of the *Dípawanso* being, according to Mr. Turnour, the record of the succession of Buddhist teachers, in which, he says, it is full of chronological mistakes. Without withholding all assent from the application of the name Piyadassano—Sans. Priyadarsana, of kind or agreeable appearance, to Asoka,—it seems very inexplicable why, in none of the inscriptions, his own appellation, Asoka, or Dharmasoka, should ever be mentioned. In no one of the rock or pillar inscriptions is there the slightest trace of such a name as Asoka. There is no reason, as far as we are aware, why an Indian prince, whether Buddhist or Brahmanical, should prefer an alias to his proper denomination, and the practice of all later times is opposed to such a peculiarity. In the numerous inscriptions found in other parts of India, the names of the Princes, and very commonly of their ancestors for several generations, are recorded, and we may be reasonably enough surprised that in this instance alone, an epithet should have supplanted a name,—for that Piyadasi is not a proper name, but an epithet, we not only infer

from its literal signification, but we know it to be so from its being, according to Mr. Turnour, the title of one of the twenty-four Buddhas in the *Dípawanso*. We find it also to have been applied to one other prince at least, who was a different person from Asoka. *Su-darsana*, which is much the same thing, or good-looking, is a very common name for Hindu princes,—but we have a *Piyadasano*—or in the *Māgadhi* form, *Piyadasane*—in the *Kalpa Sūtra*, one of the scriptural authorities of the Jains, of which a translation by the Rev. Mr. Stevenson, has been lately published by the Translation Committee. The term *Piyadasane*, which he renders, lovely to behold, is there applied to the Raja *Siddhārtha*, sovereign of *Kundagrāma*, and putative father of *Mahāvira*, the last Jain *Tirthankara*, who, according to the Jains, was the preceptor of the Buddha *Gautama*. The same prince also bears the title of *Devanupiya*,—the beloved of the Gods—so that neither of these epithets is exclusively restricted to Asoka, even if they were ever applied to him.

That they were so applied is rendered doubtful by chronological difficulties, of which it is not easy to dispose: *Piyadasi* appears to have lived, either at the same time with, or subsequent to, *Antiochus*. Could this have been the case if he was Asoka? For the determination of this question, we must investigate the date at which the two princes flourished, as far as the materials which are available will permit.

The first point to be adjusted is, which *Antiochus* is referred to. There are several of the name amongst the kings of the Seleucidan dynasty, whose sway commencing in Syria, extended at various times, in the early periods of their history, through Persia to the confines of India. Of these, the two first, *Antiochus Soter* and *Antiochus Theos*, were too much taken up with occurrences in Greece and in the west of Asia, to maintain any intimate connexion with India, and it is not until the time of *Antiochus the Great*, the fifth Seleucidan monarch, that we have any positive indication of an intercourse between India and Syria. It is recorded of this prince that he invaded India, and formed an alliance with its sovereign, named by the Greek writers, *Sophagasenas*, in the first member of which it requires the etymological courage of a *Wilford* to discover Asoka. The late *Augustus Schlegel* conjectured the Greek name to represent the Sanskrit, *Saubhāgya sena*, he whose army is attended by prosperity; but we have no such prince in Hindu tradition, and it could scarcely have been a synonyme of *Asoka*, the literal sense of which is, he who has no sorrow. Neither is *Sophagasenas* more like *Piyadasi*, and so far therefore we derive no assistance as to the identification of *Antiochus*. Still, with reference to the facts, and to the allusion to his victorious progress, which

Tablet XIII. seems to contain, we can scarcely doubt that he was the person intended, and that the Antiochus of the inscription is Antiochus the Great, who ascended the throne, B.C. 223, and was killed, B.C. 187. The date of his eastern expedition is from B.C. 212 to B.C. 205.

There is, however, an obvious difficulty in the way of the identification from the names of the princes which are found in connexion with that of Antiochus, and which the thirteenth Tablet appears to recapitulate as those of contemporary princes,—subjugated, if the conjectural interpretation be correct, by Antiochus. With respect to one of them, Ptolemy, this is allowable, for Antiochus the Great engaged in war with Ptolemy Philopator, the fourth king of Egypt, with various success, and concluded peace with him before he undertook his expedition to Bactria and India. He therefore was contemporary with Antiochus the Great. It is, however, to be recollected that Ptolemy Philopator was preceded by three other princes of the same name, Ptolemy Soter, Ptolemy Philadelphus, and Ptolemy Evergetes,—extending through a period of rather more than a century, or from B.C. 323 to B.C. 221. These princes were frequently engaged in hostilities with the Seleucidan kings of Syria, and we cannot therefore positively determine which of them is referred to in the inscription. The long continuance of the same name, however, among the kings of Egypt, as it was retained until the Roman conquest, no doubt made it familiar throughout the East, and we need not be surprised to find it at Kapur di Giri or Girnar.

The same circumstance will not account for the insertion of the name of Mako, probably Magas, for although there was such a prince, he was far removed from India, and of no particular celebrity. Magas was made ruler of Cyrene by his father-in-law, Ptolemy Soter, the first Greek king of Egypt, about B.C. 308. He had a long reign of fifty years, to B.C. 258. He was not therefore contemporary with Antiochus the Great, dying thirty-five years before that prince's accession. He was connected with Antiochus Soter, having married his daughter, and entered into an alliance with him against Ptolemy Philadelphus,—and this association with the names of Antiochus and Ptolemy, generally but not accurately known, may have led to his being enumerated with the two other princes of the same designation, Ptolemy Philopator, and Antiochus the Great. There was a Magas also, the brother of Philopator, but he is of no historical note, and was put to death by his brother in the beginning of his reign. The allusion is therefore, no doubt to the Magas of Cyrene.

It is impossible to explain the juxta-position of the other two names, Antigonus and Alexander, upon any principle of chronological

computation, although we can easily comprehend how the names were familiarly known. That of Alexander the Great must of course have left a durable impression, but he is antecedent to any of his generals who made themselves kings after his death. It is very unlikely that his son Alexander, who was not born till after his death, and from the age of three years was brought up in Macedonia, where he was murdered when only twelve years old, should be the person intended, and a greater probability would attach to an Alexander who was Satrap of Persia in the beginning of the reign of Antiochus the Great, and rebelled against him. He was defeated and killed, B.C. 223. So far therefore we have an Alexander contemporary with Antiochus, if that be thought essential; but it seems more likely that here as in the case of Magas, the concurrence of names is no evidence of synchronism, and arises from the name being familiarly known without any exact knowledge of the persons by whom they were borne.

Such seems to be the case also with respect to Antigonus. The most celebrated of the name, Alexander's general who succeeded to the sovereignty of Phrygia and Lycia, extended his authority to the East by the defeat and death of Eumenes, and his name may thus have become known in India, although the scene of his victories over his rival was somewhat remote from the frontier, or in Persia and Media. The latter portions of his career were confined to Asia Minor and Greece, and he was killed B.C. 301. He was contemporary with the first Ptolemy but not with Antiochus, having been killed twenty years before the accession of Antiochus Soter. We have another Antigonus, the grandson of the preceding, who was contemporary with Antiochus Soter, but his life was spent in Macedonia and Greece, and it is not likely therefore that any thing should have been known of him in India. It can only be the first Antigonus whose designation reached an Indian prince, and the mention of him in conjunction with Ptolemy, Antiochus, Magas, and Alexander, shows clearly that the chronology of the inscription was utterly at fault if it intended to assign a contemporary existence to princes who were scattered through, at least, an interval of a century. We must look, therefore, not to dates, but to the notoriety of the names, and the probability of their having become known in India, for the identification of the persons intended. Under this view, I should refer Alexander to Alexander the Great, Antigonus to his successor, Magas to the son-in-law of Ptolemy Philadelphus, Ptolemy to either or all of the four first princes of Egypt, and Antiochus to the only one of the number, who we know from classical record did visit India, and who from the purport of the inscriptions we may infer was known there

personally,—Antiochus the Great. In this case we obtain for the date of the inscriptions some period subsequent to B.C. 205, at which it seems very unlikely that Asoka was living.

There is an entire accordance between the Brahmans and the Buddhists as to the descent of Asoka. The series of princes in the Purānas and in the Mahāwanso are manifestly the same, and were both derived probably from a common source, the lists of the bards, or professional chroniclers, to whom the preservation of historical traditions was consigned. Asoka, according to both was the son of Bindusāro (called in one Girnar inscription, Pushpagupta) the son of Chandragupta, and there is no reasonable ground for questioning the identity of Chandragupta, or Chandagutta, with the Sandrocottos or Sandrocottos of the Greeks, the ally of Seleucus Nicator, B.C. 305. According to the Vayu Purana, Chandragupta reigned twenty-four years, and his successor twenty-five. Some of the Buddhist authorities assign thirty-four years to the first, but the Attakathā, in a passage, the reading of which Mr. Turnour prefers, agrees with the Purana¹. To Bindusāro, twenty-eight years are assigned, which makes an interval of fifty-two years between the accessions of Chandragupta and Asoka. How much of Chandragupta's reign preceded his alliance with Seleucus, we have no means of ascertaining. As far as we can trust to Justin, he was personally known to Alexander, although not then reigning; and it appears generally from classical authority, that he attained sovereignty not long after Alexander's invasion. If we deduct five years from that event, we shall place the beginning of Chandragupta's reign about B.C. 318; and that of Asoka's will consequently commence about B.C. 266. He reigned, according to one authority twenty-six years, and to another thirty-seven years; if we admit the longer period he will have died 229 B.C., or seventeen years before Antiochus the Great engaged in his Eastern warfare, twenty years at least before the supposed alliance with him could have taken place. If we are to class the inscriptions in the order of their succession, which however is not exactly the case, we should have to place the alliance of Piyadasi with Antiochus still earlier. It is alluded to for instance in the Second Tablet, whilst the Third Tablet is dated in the twelfth year of his reign, or B.C. (266—12)=254, which is forty-two years earlier than the date of the commencement of the expedition of Antiochus to the East. Of course the formation of the alliance would have fallen within the limits of the reign of Asoka, some years prior to his decease, and in

¹ Journal Asiatic Society, Bengal, vi., 725, note.

proportion as it approached the beginning of his reign, the distance between the probable date of the alliance and the existence of Asoka is enhanced. To obviate the chronological difficulty it has been suggested that the Antiochus alluded to is not Antiochus Magnus, but Antiochus Theos, who reigned from B.C. 261 to B.C. 246, and who would therefore be contemporary with Asoka. This is no doubt true, but as intimated above, historical events are opposed to the maintenance of any friendly connexion between the princes of India and Syria during the reign of Antiochus Theos. At its very commencement he was involved in hostilities with the King of Egypt; the war continued during the greater portion of his reign, and amongst its results, were the neglect and loss of the Eastern provinces. Media and Bactria became independent principalities, and their geographical, as well as political position must have completely intercepted all communication between India and Western Asia. It is very unlikely that an Indian sovereign would have promulgated any alliance with the enemy of his immediate neighbours, and we should rather look for the names of Arsaces or Theodotus in his edicts, than that of Antiochus Theos. We cannot, therefore, upon historical grounds admit the identity of the Antiochus of the inscriptions with Antiochus Theos, any more than we can recognize an alliance between Asoka and Antiochus Magnus, as chronologically probable upon such premises as we derive from classical Pauranic, and partly Buddhist data.

If, indeed, we are guided solely by the latter, we shall render the synchronism of the two princes still more impossible. According to the *Dīpawanso* and *Mahāwanso*, Dharmasoka was inaugurated two hundred and eighteen years after the death of Buddha; his inauguration took place four years after his accession, and we place the latter therefore two hundred and fourteen years after the Nirvān of Gautama. The date of this event was B.C. 543, and $543 - 214 = \text{B.C. } 329$, and Asoka, therefore, ascended the throne, according to the Buddhists, before the invasion, not of Antiochus, but of Alexander the Great. This however must be wrong, and Mr. Turnour acknowledges that the chronology of the Buddhist chronicles is here at fault; he makes the error amount to about sixty years, and conceives that it was an intentional vitiation of the chronology: with what purpose he has not explained. It is enough for us to determine that Asoka cannot have been the cotemporary of Antiochus the Great, according to the chronology either of Brahman or Buddhist. That Piyadasi was the cotemporary of Antiochus, or even posterior to him, is evident from the inscription, and therefore Piyadasi and Asoka are not one and the same person.

That Asoka became a convert to Buddhism after commencing his reign as a sanguinary tyrant, may or may not be true: we have only the assertions of the Buddhists for the fact. But allowing it to be true, if Asoka was not the author of the edicts in question, no inference of their Buddhist character can be drawn from his conversion to the faith of Buddha, and the uncertain evidence afforded by their language is not rendered less equivocal by any positive proof of their having been promulgated by a prince who was a zealous patron of the doctrines of Sākyasinha.

But who then was Piyadasi, the beloved of the gods? This is a question not easily answered. The term is evidently an epithet applied to more than one individual, and not the proper designation of any one person exclusively. We have no such name in any of the Brahmanical traditions, and find it in the Buddhist, as indicating a sovereign prince, to whom it could not have been applied consistently with chronological data, upon the authority of a work of the fourth century of our era. That any uncertainty with regard to its appropriation should exist, seems very incompatible with the extent of the dominions ruled over by the prince of the inscriptions, as far as we are to infer, from the sites in which they are found, as Guzerat, Cuttack, Behar, Delhi, and the Punjab. A monarch, to whom all India, except the extreme south, was subject, must surely have left some more positive trace of his existence than a mere epithet, complimentary to his good looks, and shared with many others of equally pleasing appearance. That such almost universal sovereignty in India was ever exercised by a single prince is extremely improbable, and it is undeniable from the evidence of the inscriptions themselves, that they have not been sculptured, in the situations in which they occur, contemporaneously with the year of any individual reign. Thus, in all the rock inscriptions, the third and fourth edicts are said to be issued in the twelfth year of Piyadasi's inauguration; the fifth and eighth, in the tenth year; the two later edicts in point of time taking precedence of the two earlier, in the order of inscription—an utter impossibility. We can only infer, therefore, that they were simultaneously inscribed. Mr. Prinsep states, that it is so specified in the Fourteenth Tablet, but I am unable to understand the passage in that sense. That it was the case however is obvious, from the inverted order of the dates, and from the uniform appearance of the inscriptions. The whole must have been cut, therefore, at some subsequent period to the latest of the dates. How long subsequent, is another question of impossible solution; but it is very improbable that the rocks of Guzerat, Dhauli, and Kapur di Giri, were all engraved at

the same time. The operation must have been spread over some years, and it is not unlikely that it was subsequent to the date of their reputed author, if he ever had a real existence. It seems, however, not improbable, that the rulers of the several countries or influential religious persons adopted the shadow of a name, to give authority to the promulgation of edicts intended to reform the immoral practices of the people, and for that purpose repeated documents which had acquired popular celebrity in some particular locality not yet ascertained.

An indisputable inference is also to be drawn from an assertion of the inscriptions themselves against their homogeneous character. Either those prior to the twelfth year of Piyadasi's accession, or those subsequent to it, and extending to the twenty-seventh, cannot be Buddhist, for the latter declares that an edict issued in the twelfth year of Piyadasi's reign, was caused to be destroyed as being a sinful obstruction of the increase of Dharma, or as Mr. Prinsep renders it,—from the Raja's regarding his former religion as sin,—Inscription of the Eastern compartment of the Delhi Lát. If the translation is correct, and in substance it seems to be so, there are two sets of opposing doctrines in the inscriptions, and of course both cannot be Buddhist. Mr. Prinsep comes to the conclusion that the Buddhist account of the date of Asoka's conversion, the fourth year of his reign, is erroneous, and that he could not have changed his creed until after his twelfth year. Then it follows that most, if not all the Rock inscriptions are not Buddhist, for the only dates specified are the tenth and twelfth years. Those on the Láts appear to be all of the twenty-seventh year. If, however, those of the earlier dates are not Buddhist, neither are those of the later, for there is no essential difference in their purport. They all enforce the preference of moral to ceremonial observances, and often employ the very same phraseology. We can only reconcile the contradiction by supposing the language of the Lát inscription to be misinterpreted,—and we must then feel how unsafe it is to come to any confident conclusion upon premises so insecure as the imperfect rendering of the very obscure expressions of the original inscriptions.

From these considerations, I have been compelled to withhold my unqualified assent to the confident opinions that have been entertained respecting the object and origin of the inscriptions. Without denying the possibility of their being intended to disseminate Buddhism, and their emanating from the Maurya prince Asoka, there are difficulties in the way of both conclusions, which, to say the least, render such an attribution extremely uncertain. The inscriptions still require to be

interpreted by some person who is at once a thorough Sanskrit and Pali scholar, and possibly they still require to be re-examined and transcribed: at any rate, such is indisputably the case with the Kapur di Giri inscription. And until we have readings and translations on which we can implicitly rely, it will be prudent to refrain from substituting positiveness for possibility.

In coming to this conclusion, nothing can be farther from my intention than to undervalue what has been attempted and accomplished. Infinite care and labour have been bestowed upon the transcription of the inscriptions, as far as circumstances have permitted; and at Girnar in particular, whatever anomalies and obscurities occur, must be chargeable to the carelessness and ignorance of the sculptor, as we cannot question our being in possession of most faithful copies, after the able exertions of Wilson, Postans, Jacob, and Westergaard. Dhauli and Kapur di Giri have not yet been examined under equal advantages.

With regard also to the translations which we owe to the learning and ingenuity of the late James Prinsep, we must remember, that they were the first attempts to convey a knowledge of the purport of documents in a new character and unknown language; and that copies of the Lāt inscription had been published for many years, but had baffled the application of the most eminent scholars, and had remained undecyphered until James Prinsep discovered their real nature, and rendered them readable by his successors, without which they would probably have continued to the present day as unintelligible as ever. Whatever may be objected also to particular passages, the substance of the inscriptions is no doubt correctly translated, and whether it justifies the conclusions which the translator has drawn, is fair matter for discussion. Its incorrectness, even if established, will not invalidate his claims to our acknowledgment and admiration for what he has accomplished with unequalled labour, incomparable ingenuity, and unrivalled success.
